

The Inquirer.

A Journal of Liberal Religious Thought and Life.

ESTABLISHED IN 1842.]

[REGISTERED AS A NEWSPAPER.]

No. 3431.
NEW SERIES, No. 535.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 28, 1908.

[ONE PENNY.]

CONTENTS

NOTES OF THE WEEK...	193
LEADER:—	
The Church Free and Catholic ...	200
ARTICLES:—	
Ministers' Pension and Insurance Fund...	194
The Coming of Spring ...	194
Hegelianism and Freedom ...	195
Our Great Problem—Discussion ...	201
CORRESPONDENCE:—	
Doctrine of the Will...	197
Fideism ...	197
Licensing Reform ...	203
LITERATURE:—	
William Clarke ...	198
PROVINCIAL LETTER:—	
The North Midlands...	205
ORITUARY:—	
Mr. W. D. Houghton ...	199
Mr. Thomas Davies ...	199
THE CHILDREN'S COLUMN ...	199
NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES ...	206
OUR CALENDAR ...	207
ADVERTISEMENTS...	207

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

THE Bishop of St. Asaph's has re-introduced an Education Bill which is regarded in some influential quarters as a possible basis of agreement, or at least of negotiation between parties. The essential principles of the Bill are:—(a) The "Church" concedes full popular control of the schools and freedom of all teachers from religious tests; (b) simple Bible teaching is to be given as a part of the regular instruction; (c) facilities are to be allowed on certain days for special religious instruction, by the local clergy or other persons, in the cases of children whose parents desire such instruction. Two points at once arise. First, although teachers are to be exempt from religious tests, they are to be at liberty to give the special religious instruction. This will assuredly be a difficulty. Secondly, the entry of diverse theological experts into the publicly maintained schools, and the segregation of the scholars into little sectarian flocks, will not be a pleasant spectacle. But the spirit of compromise appears to be in the air, and something useful may be arranged, logical people notwithstanding!

THERE is no mistaking the large share taken by the brewers in the Peckham election, though many other agencies were at work to win the seat back to the party which, till the last general election, so long held it. Though the violent vulgarity and questionable methods employed must have shocked a good many people; we

cannot really be surprised at this ebullition, seeing who they are who feel the menace of the new Licensing Bill. Of course the intended legislation will go on, and thoughtful men on both sides will be the more determined not to let public life be "throttled" (to use Lord Rosebery's word) by so sinister a force in our midst. We are glad to see that the bishops, or some of them, are speaking out strongly in support of the principles of the Bill, and that the Archbishop of Canterbury in particular is very lucidly and sanely putting its case forward in opposition to the exaggerations current. Several important Unionist journals, notably the *Morning Post*, are doing good service in exposing some of these exaggerations; and the *Guardian*, which ranges in strong opposition to the Bill, has very severely rebuked the people who have been threatening the Church with loss of financial support if the clergy support the Bill.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE, whose ability has been displayed in so many and so important negotiations in business life, made a noteworthy statement at the Queen's Hall on Thursday. Speaking "two days after Peckham," as he said, he declared that the Government would go on with the Licensing Bill at all costs. He bore eloquent testimony to the courage and public spirit of the Archbishop of Canterbury in spurning the threats and bribes of "the trade," and he pretty clearly intimated that "differences" between Nonconformists and the Church (of course on the Education Bill) could be, and ought to be, reconciled. The meeting, a convention of temperance delegates, responded with a cordiality which was highly significant.

THE late Duke of Devonshire represented a type of character so valuable in national life that we all feel a sense of loss in his death. Not conspicuous as an orator or a political genius, he was always felt to be an earnest and careful worker for the public weal. The sincerity of his character has been recognised in many a tribute to his memory. We feel peculiar satisfaction in recalling his fidelity to sound educational policy, notwithstanding party changes. Mr. Asquith, speaking in the House of Commons of the great position the duke had made for himself in the public confidence, ascribed it to his life of single-minded devotion to duty, and added:—"There has been no more splendid example in our time of service which can be rendered to the State by simplicity of nature, sincerity of conviction, directness

of purpose, intuitive insight into practical conditions, quiet and inflexible courage, and, above all, I would say, tranquil indifference to praise and blame, and by absolute disinterestedness. These are the qualities which we are proud to think our country breeds in her sons. They were never more happily mixed, or more fruitfully employed, than in the character and life of the Duke of Devonshire." The Parliamentary correspondent of the *Daily News* aptly quoted Tennyson's ode on the death of the Duke of Wellington as not unfitting in this case also:—"Truth teller was our English Duke," "rich in saving common sense," "in his simplicity sublime," "whole in himself, a common good."

THE late Rev. Benjamin Waugh, whose name will long be honoured as that of the founder of the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, was trained for the Congregational Ministry at Airedale College, Bradford. He held three pastorates previous to his devoting his whole time to the work of saving the children. It was during his pastorate at Greenwich that he came into touch with so many cases of child cruelty that he was impressed with the extent and awfulness of this particular evil. He awoke to the terrible discovery that there were thousands of unnatural parents devoid of all sense of parental responsibility, and many who bore "a vengeful grudge against their children for being born and becoming a burden to them." His booklet, "The Gaol-Cradle: Who Rocks It?" directed the attention of the nation to the need of delivering the children from inhuman parents. The society was founded in 1884, and in 1889 was passed the Children's Charter promoted by the Society. Mr. Waugh was editor of the *Sunday Magazine* from 1874 to 1896.

INTERNATIONAL Congresses of all kinds seem to grow in numbers and frequency. The Congregationalists hold their Third International Council at Edinburgh in July next. The Council will be in session for ten days, which period will, according to the draft programme, be filled with conferences, discussions, and services touching all sides of church life and thought. Of 400 delegates some 150 are expected from the United States. The churches of Edinburgh have cordially undertaken the provision of hospitality for this invading army of delegates. The Baptists hold a Congress of their "World Alliance" at Berlin, August 29 to September 3. The draft programme of the English section

has been published. The proceedings will commence with the usual welcome to delegates, when there will be a roll-call for each of the four countries in the United Kingdom, and appointed sponsors for each country will reply. Denominational consciousness is likely to be very marked, for amongst the numerous subjects to be dealt with are "Baptist Heroes," "The Development of Baptists in Europe," "Baptists as Champions of Liberty of Conscience," "The Baptist Position and Modern Culture," and three other specifically Baptist topics.

MINISTERS' PENSION AND INSURANCE FUND.

THE half-yearly meeting of the Board of Managers was held on Tuesday, 17th inst., at which the annual report and accounts were submitted and adopted. The report gave examples which showed how important it is for beneficiary members to include life insurance as well as pension in their policies. Six new beneficiary members had been elected during the year, making the total up to 87. Having pointed out a further diminution in the subscription list, the report continued:—

"If it were not for the improved income from dividends, which has risen from £640 8s. 3d. to £769 19s. 8d., the financial statement for this year would not have been satisfactory. The managers urge upon the donors and subscribers that they should endeavour to enlist the subscriptions of other friends who might be interested in this most serviceable organisation.

"A legacy of £100 has been gratefully received during the year from the estate of the late Mr. Hodgson Pratt, and the capital now stands at £25,447 14s. 6d., an addition of £127 17s. 8d. having been made to the surplus income account, with which the managers can deal more freely than the Capital Fund, and which constitutes a strong reserve.

"It is gratifying to know that several congregations have responded to the appeal for annual subscriptions, and more would have done so if circumstances had permitted. There are now 18 congregations on the list of subscribers.

"The managers record with deep regret the death of Mr. Charles W. Jones, only a few months after he had capitalised his annual subscription to the fund, which otherwise would have suffered a serious loss of £50 per annum."

Since the period covered by the report, two further insurances have been effected by members already approved, and at the meeting the applications of five more ministers were accepted, and a sum set aside for an aged minister for whom a fund has been raised, to be paid in annual instalments during his life. This will bring up the number of beneficiary members to 95. In the case of another minister of advanced age, a promise was made to give assistance to any fund that may be raised on his behalf to provide an annuity in case of retirement.

TO CORRESPONDENTS:—Communications have been received from the following:—A. S. B., E. F. C., C. B. D., E. F., R. J. G., I. McG., R. A. W.

THE COMING OF SPRING.

SLOWLY but surely the spring is born. Three days ago the wind shifted suddenly to the south, and the air became quite balmy. The crocus in my garden have opened their gold and purple cups to the light; a thrush in an elm-tree sings for joy. He is so happy that he sings.

It is early for the primroses, yet in the sheltered copses and hedgerows they are already peeping through last autumn's dead leaves. The catkins on the willows that grow by the river are golden in the sunshine, the blackthorns are sprinkled with tiny white blossoms, as though the winter snow had not quite melted from them, and the almond trees in the garden—the beautiful almond trees—are pink.

In two months the bluebells and the cowslips will be in bloom; in three, summer will be here in her full glory, decked with flowers, musical with bees.

Every day the world turns one half of her glorious face to the sunshine; every night the sky is spangled with stars.

It is difficult to imagine that the world is not perfectly new and that this is not the first spring that has ever gladdened man; and yet for a thousand years the spring has followed the winter, a thousand summers have followed the spring, and a thousand times the swallows have returned from the south.

How suddenly the weather changes! Yesterday the sun smiled from a cloudless sky; it was as warm as summer. To-day the sky is grey, and the silver spears of the rain lash the drinking earth; the crocus have closed their petals, but the thrush is still happy; he has found a snail, and is trying to crack its shell on a stone. Tap, tap, tap, tap, he goes, while the rain showers round him. Nature is beautiful even in her tears, raindrops, purer than pearls, sparkle on the trees, and hang like silver lamps from gossamers, and there is a damp sweet scent in the air that is very good to breathe.

Rain and sun alike help forward the spring; the hard, sharp-pointed cases that contain the folded buds are moistened and warmed, the earth is softened that the plant contained in the seed may push its way up. Life that lay dormant, almost dead, in bulb or chrysalis is quickened and begins to breathe; soon it will wake indeed. So, "Blossom by blossom, the spring begins."

Another day passes, and a gale is blowing; the wild March wind, that is like a lion, goes singing through the pine woods, and, buffeting the trees, warm and wet from the sea, heavy with odours that it has stolen from the Atlantic; it rattles my window, as it whistles and whoops round the house. I hear it banging doors, and booming and shouting round street corners, when I lie in bed; but I know that even the wind is helping forward the time of the roses. It clears from the buds the useless husks that hinder the young leaves; it brings the rain; it drives away last autumn's dead stuff; and sweeps the world, as a careful housewife sweeps her house when she is spring-cleaning.

So the sun, the rain, and the wind help forward the birth of the spring.

Another change. "The mesmeriser snow," as Browning calls it, has fallen silently and thickly in the night, and the

clear, cold sunlight of the early morning shines on a white and wonderful world. The pure snow, as yet untrodden by man, lies thickly, too, on the roads and pavements, a coverlet of white, and the trees are outlined in silver. In a few hours the spring sunshine will melt it, and it will be trampled into slush and mud by men and horses; but now for a space the city is beautiful, pure as a virgin robed in white, beautiful like a beautiful thought.

The air is very clear and clean, as it often is after a fall of snow, and the heavens are coldly blue. I regret that the snow cannot stay a little longer. I am sorry that it will melt so soon. It is always sad to think that beautiful things pass, sad to know that snow melts, that children grow old, and that roses are only lovely for a season.

The snow, as well as the sun, the rain, and the wind, help forward the spring; the tender green life of the fields, called to life by last week's sunshine, sleeps comfortably beneath the white counterpane, and the chemical properties in the snow act as manure to the vegetable world. It is wonderful, so very wonderful, this happy birth of spring!

And behind this beautiful awakening, pulsing through every tree and grass blade, quickening the buds till they break and blossom, calling forth the roses, and sending to the just and the unjust alike the rain and the sunshine, the wind and the snow, is the love of God. The flowers, Nature's inarticulate children, are symbols of that love, for love and beauty are not two things, but one, wherever there is a truly beautiful thing there is, or has been, love. Wherever there is a beautiful thing there should be reverence.

The flowers open their petals and look up to the light; the birds sing their praises to their Maker; the butterflies and moths, that lay as though dead the winter through, wound in their shroud-like chrysalides, are called to life and wing their way in rapture up to heaven.

I like to think of Jesus as one who loved nature, and, because he loved, understood; for no one can really understand anything until he or she loves that thing. I like to think of him walking on the beautiful wind-swept Galilean uplands in the spring sunshine, wondering at the lilies, watching the birds, and drawing from the natural beauties around him something that confirmed and strengthened his faith in the love and fatherhood of God, and the brotherhood of man—I had almost said the brotherhood and sisterhood of all living things—and his great faith in the life hereafter.

For the spring brings with it, year after year, its lesson and its hope;—an old and hackneyed thought, but not too old to be true, for we know that the promise of April will pass into the perfect fulfilment of June.

There is much to be learnt from the flowers, for just as flowers grow beautifully and naturally on the hill-side, so we should strive to live beautiful and natural lives. We all want to be more natural and less artificial, more free and less conventional. I look forward to a state of society where this may be possible, to a time when everyone will be able to develop, without let or hindrance, the possibilities

of their natures, when men's souls will open to the light, and become beautiful, as flowers are beautiful.

Then winter will, indeed, pass away; the spring will gladden the earth, and the round world will roll forward from eternal darkness into everlasting light. In the city squares and gardens the black soot-begrimed trees are breaking into tiny leaves of delicate green. One knows what they are doing, they are finding expression. The hidden sap is called to life by the sunshine and the rain. It is so with men, outwardly unbeautiful, they have hidden within them the possibility of something better; like the trees they must find expression or remain dumb. The inmost self is the real self, the real man is the hidden man, never seen by strangers, and often the possessor does not know of his possession. We see a barman, and we think he has no thoughts above beer and spittoons, or a young thread-bare city clerk, and imagine, when we see him reading the penny horrible or the football column of the evening paper, that these satisfy his intellectual need; and yet if, by some ill chance, we had only been able to see those trees in winter, and had never heard of the spring, we could not have guessed that they would ever be covered with beautiful leaves. It needed something to call those leaves to life, the kind sunshine, and the gentle rain, did what the November fogs, and the bitter nor'easter was unable to do; the trees needed a congenial atmosphere before they were able to express themselves. It is the same with men and women; if we want our brothers and sisters to develop their hidden possibilities, we must endeavour to create for them a congenial atmosphere.

As the rain and the sun called forth the leaves whose life lay in the heart of the tree, so love will call forth those perfect flowers whose seeds lie sleeping in the human heart.

My ideal society would be one where it would be possible for every member of that society to develop freely, without let or hindrance, and without harm to the whole, his individuality. As things are now, this is impossible, but in some distant future when the human race has progressed towards its ultimate goal, I think this will be possible.

Humanity is scarcely out of its swaddling clothes, to us it seems that man has lived on the world a very long time, but when we remember that it takes trillions of years to make a star, we see that he has been here a very short time. Consider how much he has done, yet this is nothing to what he will do in the uncounted years that are to be. To humanity nothing is impossible, and man will evolve into something high and noble, at present beyond our comprehension.

Without previous knowledge, who could foretell an oak forest by looking at a handful of acorns, or imagine a butterfly by observing the insects' tiny eggs?

And, therefore, from things as they are, it is impossible to foretell the far-off future. But the ultimate destiny of man is assured, and that that destiny is a splendid one, who can doubt?

How many times, ere it is fulfilled, the

rain and the sunshine will call forth the buds, the spring gladden the earth, and the roses blossom and die, and blossom again, who can say? Meanwhile, as Mr. Swinburne sings—

“Winter's rains and ruins are over,
And all the season of snows and sins;
The day dividing lover and lover,
The light that loses, the night that wins;
And time remembered is grief forgotten,
And frosts are slain and flowers begotten,
And in green underwood and cover,
Blossom by blossom the spring begins”
—the spring-time of the year, and the spring-time of the human race.

J. W. NORG ROVE.

HEGELIANISM AND FREEDOM.

I.

THOSE who would understand the “Hegelian”* position must be asked to remember that for us free-will means, and can only mean, free *willing*. When the will is represented as a mere abstract possibility of action, or as a faculty which lies dormant and inactive while the agent is “thinking it over,” the reply is that our psychology knows of no such faculty, and our logic finds it a contradiction. You cannot speak of will as free while it is in the state of as yet willing nothing, because the will which is willing nothing is itself nothing. Is it not a strange procedure to say my will is free only when I am *not* willing, or in the moment *before* I have begun to will? *Before* I will there is no will, and therefore nothing to which the idea of freedom can be attached.

Again, for us, freedom—perfect freedom—means the absolutely complete, unimpeded, and harmonious activity of a rational will. The only perfectly free will is the will whose activity expresses, without let, hindrance, or check, all that a rational will may be or do. To whatsoever extent will is let or hindered or held back from fully expressing its own nature to that extent it is not free. There is a sense, therefore, in which every finite personality is free, and another sense in which he is not free. He is free just so far as his actions express his true nature as a rational being; he is not free, but impeded and held back, just so far as the limitations of his finite condition, prevent him from fully expressing all that he has it in him to be or become. Perfect freedom is unattainable by man in his present state. Perfect unfreedom, however, is equally impossible. Man is alike incapable of wholly raising himself into a god or wholly sinking himself into a beast.

In other words, we “Hegelians” interpret freedom in a positive, not in a negative, sense. We define it by its positive contents, not alone by its negative conditions.

* I use this term for a reason with which your readers are familiar in another connection, viz., not because I like it, but because other people think it appropriate. There are some situations in which the best way to get rid of a name is to adopt it; and the best way to retain it is to announce that you are anxious to get rid of it. Thus, Unitarians, by constantly advertising that they don't want to be called Unitarians, practically ensure that the world will call them nothing else.

We are Libertarian Positivists. A Libertarian Negativist is one who regards freedom as the state of not being determined by anything at all. We, on the contrary, hold that freedom is the positive state of being determined by the highest and best you know, *and of knowing that that which determines you is the highest and best*. It is obvious that no better state than this is attainable by man. I do not agree with Professor Upton that a man can ever “turn away from the moral ideal.” If he could, he would not *know* that he was doing wrong. His consciousness that he does wrong is the working of the moral ideal within him, then and there; and proves conclusively that he has not turned away from it, but acted in the presence of its light. Nor do I get my notion of freedom by the negative method, considering what he might have done but didn't do. I get it by the positive method of considering what he did do.

We “Hegelians” do not think we are attached to the moral ideal as to a kind of balloon which is pulling us up into heaven and the strings binding us to which we are at any moment “free” to cut. We regard the moral ideal as the essence of personality and the active principle of self-consciousness. It is no removable adjunct of human life from which a man might detach himself and still remain a man. Man can no more divest himself of the moral ideal than he can strip the flesh from his skeleton, or pour the life blood from his body and still live. We say that man not only *cannot* do this, but *cannot* even be thought of as doing so. And this emphatic *cannot* is the sole slender ground our opponents have for the oft-repeated charge that we are “determinists.” But what does it all amount to? Our *cannot* simply means that man cannot both be and not be himself. He cannot at one and the same time be essentially a moral being and “free” to be essentially an immoral being. If a man is free to “turn away from the moral ideal” he is free to cease to be himself; which seems to us absurd. It is as though you were to say that a man thinks with his brain and yet has the power to think the brain with which he thinks out of existence. And a very dangerous absurdity too. For *that in man* which thus “turns away” from his deepest nature now itself becomes his deepest nature. And what sort of nature would that be? I should say essentially irrational and essentially bad. At all events this “free-will” which then “turns away” from goodness cannot itself be good; and if such free-will is the deepest thing in man, then the deepest thing in man is not good.

Now, if I am to uphold any sort of “faith in man,” it must be on the ground that the deepest thing about him is essentially good, which is precisely what *this* deepest thing isn't. The defenders of this doctrine appear to us “Hegelians” to pull down more and better things than they build up. It is, of course, an old story. How can I continue to believe in a being of whom you tell me that his deepest nature consists in his “freedom” to betray the ground on which I believe in him? I confess that I find it difficult to grasp the full meaning of our opponents at this

point; though it often seems to me that in their handling of the matter they are steering the ship of Ethics straight for the rocks of logical disaster. If they hold, with us, that man is by nature a moral being, and if they add to this that the essence of man's moral nature is a free power to put itself "on" or "off," then there is no disguising the fact that they are propounding flat nonsense.

To us Hegelians this question of "faith in man" is vital. It is indeed the turning-point of the whole controversy. If there is anything in which we have the right to "glory" it is that in season and out we have striven to find a rational justification for "faith in man." Without that faith the business of humanity cannot go on. No one needs to be reminded, in another connection, that without faith in *Nature* all human activity would come to a standstill. Were we living in a world whose laws were liable to suspense at any moment, by some arbitrary and incalculable will, so that nobody could count on the sun rising to-morrow or the law of gravitation obtaining in the next street, we should have to give up every purpose and live from hand to mouth as best we could. But it is not always seen that the same kind of confidence is necessary, more necessary even, in regard to that part of the world which is covered by the operations of the human will, *i.e.*, society, the part of the world with which our own wills have most intimately to do. Unless there be some principle of law-abidingness in the structure of the social life, on which we can rely and count, social purpose must be abandoned, intelligent co-operation must fail, and morality itself become impossible. Hence the chief ground of quarrel with our opponents is, that in their zeal for freedom, they have propounded a doctrine of the will which cuts the element of law-abidingness clean out of the social tissue, and in the end accomplishes the destruction of free-will, by leaving man in a position in which it would be irrational to will anything at all. In listening to some current expositions of free-will my feeling is that whatever faith I might have in myself as a being endowed as they say I am, and it would be very little, I should certainly have no particle of faith in anybody else. However pleased I might be to contemplate that sort of freedom in myself, I should feel intensely uneasy in contemplating it in other people. To co-operate with them in any kind of enterprise requiring concerted and consistent action I should regard as a speculation in moral issues compared to which the proceedings of the wildest plunger were prudence itself.*

* The subject is of great practical importance at the present moment. The anarchy prevalent in "our churches" has its roots in an anarchic conception of the freedom of the will—a conception according to which each individual asserts his freedom in such a way as to negate the freedom of everybody else. This conception has well nigh destroyed the faculty of organisation. Anyone who calmly considers the present position will see that, in a sense deeper than that commonly discussed, our churches are not free at all. They have no command over their future, they have no means of common defence, they are exposed to the invasion of accident, their fortunes lie at the mercy of irresponsible and incalculable forces. A more complete form of slavery could hardly be devised by the wit of man.

It will be seen, therefore, that in handling the problem of freedom, we are guided by a social, and not alone by an individual, interest. For reasons into which I do not propose to enter, we believe that humanity is charged, collectively, with the fulfilment of a task or End. What the *full* nature of that task may be we do not profess to know; but in part it is revealed to us in the work already accomplished by the rational will of man—by existing morality, by science, by art, and the institutions of society; in part also it is revealed by the moral consciousness which accepts the work of reason and provides for its further development; and this knowledge, partial though it be, is enough for guidance. But there is one feature about the task of humanity which in our judgment admits of no question whatsoever. *It is a concerted task; i.e.*, it is the expression or working out of a single Moral Ideal, which remains one with itself throughout every phase and moment of its realisation. The Plan is one; the working out of the Plan is *together*; and it is in having a distinct but related part in the total Plan, and not otherwise, that human personality consists. Individual agents who have no part in the Plan, or are capable of willing themselves into a position outside the Plan, such individuals Hegelians regard as non-existent entities, as self-contradictory figments of thought. Man is man, the individual is the individual, just by reason of his having a definite part to play in the concerted realisation of the one Ideal. Were it not for the *concerted* nature of the human task we hold that no morality would exist or even be thinkable.

That such a conception must profoundly affect our handling of the problem of freedom is self-evident. On the one hand, man in order to be free must know that he is a member of a system held together in the unity of one Idea, and controlled by the Law of that Idea; a system, therefore, in which he can freely invest his moral energies with the absolute certainty that all the other agencies involved are so related that in the long run they *cannot* put him to confusion or play him false. Short of such knowledge the man is a slave, and incapable of any moral action whatsoever. On the other hand, it is obvious that, with his notion of concerted action before us, we cannot allow to any individual a kind of freedom in the playing of *his* part, which would be incompatible with the freedom of others to play *theirs*. Here I would venture to lay down a maxim to be rigidly followed in every discussion of human freedom—it is simply this, *Think of the others*. Plainly, if the understanding is that each co-operator in the system is free to betray the system in which he is co-operating, then, in the name of the freedom of all the others, *his* freedom ought instantly to be taken away from him. Or, putting it the other way round, how is it possible for any individual to co-operate in the system when the betrayal of the system by others is their free alternative at every moment? To institute co-operation on the understanding that the co-operators are free to play one another false and to put one another to confusion is a proposal to which Bedlam could hardly find a parallel. Freedom such as that might indeed exist in some fortuitous concourse of human atoms with no higher mission to accomplish

than to emulate the feat of the Kilkenny cats. But accept the solidarity of the race, accept the notion of humanity as charged with the execution of a concerted task, and is it too much to say that the doctrine of freedom, *on the purely individualistic basis*, becomes a stumbling-block of offence?

I confess, with all respect to the great men from whom I find myself compelled to differ, that they often seem to me to propound a doctrine of freedom which, if it were true, would destroy the organic conception of the human race and so be fatal to morality. The human task—the task of the race—would appear by their showing to be a mere miscellaneous heap of products on to which each human agent, as he passes by, is free to fling what contribution he will, or perhaps to fling nothing at all. I can only say for myself that before I can accept such a doctrine I must unlearn everything I have learnt from history, from science, from philosophy, from religion, and from the revelations of my own moral consciousness. Do these great men seriously think that it would be possible under such conditions to impress any human being with a due sense of his responsibility for doing or not doing his best? Let us imagine a singer about to take the part of Elijah. As he stands on the boards in front of the audience, let him be informed that each player in the orchestra behind him, though under orders to play the score of the "Elijah," is nevertheless known to be provided with other scores, any one of which he is "free" to play. Let him be told that there is nothing to prevent any player from playing any score he pleases, such prevention being incompatible with that "freedom" which some precious theory holds to be essential to production of good music. The big drum, for instance, knows well enough when he ought to come in, but as a "free" drum it possesses and may exercise the right to beat a tattoo when and where he will. This is the information conveyed to our singer, and it is under these conditions that we propose to hold him responsible for doing his best. I need not dwell upon the absurdity of the situation. My object is to point out that we Hegelians regard man—the individual "you" or "me"—as bearing a part in the social task essentially analogous to that of the singer here introduced. He is a member of a chorus engaged together in the production of a unitary work. As an individual performer we hold him responsible for doing his best; but such responsibility involves, as an absolutely indispensable condition, the assurance on his part that his co-performers are *bound* under the terms of a moral ideal which forms a single and intelligible whole. Delete this condition, and not only is our performer not free to do his best—he is *free to do nothing, and is responsible for nothing*. Whatever he attempts to do in the presence of this unchartered libertinism is doomed to come to naught. If, then, human society be a mere collection of individual units, each one of whom lives in perpetual presence of an open alternative, and if the deepest truth of his nature is uncontrolled freedom to take which half of the alternative he will, it follows that the freedom of each is a standing menace to the freedom of every other, all the avenues of action are blocked, rational purpose must be abandoned, and

the reign of chaos return. Here the reader may discern the force of our maxim—"think of the others." Do not so construct the freedom of the man who cooks the dinner as to destroy the freedom of him who has to eat it. All goes well with the doctrine of the "open alternative" so long as you limit your thoughts to the cook; but all goes ill when you remember that the cook's command of the open alternative involves, also, command of the eater's digestion, his sleep o'night, and his temper on rising next day. In a world so arranged that the "freedom" of each individual is subject to the uncovenanted mercies of the "open alternative" in a few thousand million of other people, it would be impossible for any moral being to live. Where no security exists no freedom can be, for in morals as in politics freedom and security are correlative terms. We Hegelians regard Humanity as one family in God, bound by ties which cannot be cut: under the conception I am now criticising the race becomes a mob of warring incompatibilities among whom the idea of personal responsibility could never even come into existence.

(To be continued.)

L. P. JACKS.

DOCTRINE OF THE WILL.

SIR,—Will you allow me a word in reply to Professor Upton's courteous letter? I should like, if I can, to make clear what I mean, whether it was what Hagel meant or not.

If I understand Professor Upton, what he holds is that in a time of temptation you can equally well take one alternative or the other offered. There is no reason except your will at the moment why you should take one rather than the other. Even your past conduct does not prejudice your choice. You are free, in the sense that you may act as though you had never acted before.

Now that appears to me palpably untrue psychologically. My own experience rejects it.

The alternative theory I suggest proceeds on the truth, as it seems to me, that we are not two selves but one, acting now nobly and now ignobly, thus justifying us in speaking of the self in its higher and lower aspect, and that all we do is expressive of what we are. At any given moment possibilities of conduct present themselves to a self so-far-defined. That does not mean that a man will always act in the light of his deepest ideas. He may be under the influence of thoughts less worthy, as impulses which blind him to reason. It will still be he, the same man, the same self who does the unworthy thing but at a moment of imperfect insight, and when his standpoint is lowered. Therefore he blames himself when he sees the base conduct in the light of his deepest ideas.

What is it which induces action? Is it an unmotivated choice, a freak of self-will? I believe that in every case, and invariably you will take the alternative you do because at the moment it promises you a satisfaction, it appears as the good to you, it offers self-realisation. Once you have that idea you will inevitably act as you do. No one ever has done

otherwise. No one ever will. What appears to you a means of self-expression, and so self-realisation, will assuredly have relation to all the ways in which up to now you have been striving to utter and find yourself, in other words to your actual character. But there is no other necessity about what you do, than that you at this moment act as at every other moment you have acted in a way which promises you satisfaction, and, in the case of alternatives, the completed satisfaction. That is the permanent and unvarying certainty. It is impossible for an observer to say just what you will do, based on a knowledge of what you have done. As Professor Upton remarks, "An incoming of larger ideas will naturally bring with it a different line of thought and action." He might have added that an incoming of lower ideas may have the same result, as in Peter's case. But why? Is it because of some necessity of cosmic evolution of which the will is the unconscious instrument? I hold not, but solely because our will goes with the idea of what at the moment is good for us, of that out of which we shall draw the advantage which is a fuller satisfaction. I act, often mistakenly enough, in the way which, I think, means the fuller finding of myself. And I do that with no exception whatsoever, and whether I am a Judas betraying a Christ, or a Christ voluntarily running the risk of death. When I say that in virtue of its universality the will "can act otherwise," I mean that it is not limited by the particulars in which it has hitherto expressed itself, but can withdraw from them and express itself otherwise, and this it will do whenever under the influence of a higher idea it has reason for so doing, that is to say, sees a way in which it can more fully realise itself.

One other word. I contest the idea that in any case freedom is the *power* of doing what you please. I hold it to be the *result* of doing what you ought.

ADDISON A. CHARLESWORTH.

FIDEISM.

SIR,—My political soul rejoices at Mr. E. L. H. Thomas taking theological occasion by the hand to play the rôle of Pacifist. (I, too, am a humble supporter of the *entente cordiale*.) But when he writes with one eye upon Gaul and the other fixedly set upon my heresies, there cannot but result a certain *strabisme*. That M. Ménégos holds a doctrine about the nature of our religious knowledge, which I think is either meaningless or untrue, is one thing. That I have described the Fideist positions in terms which Mr. Thomas regards as incorrect, is another. The latter question I can scarcely discuss, seeing that we have only Mr. Thomas's *ipse dixit* as to my incorrectness, and a reference to his June article, where, indeed, he does not "misrepresent" M. Ménégos, simply because he keeps mostly to M. Ménégos's own words. I can only point out that the quotation I gave about "religious" and "secular" things is representative of the general trend of the book. (By the way, I did not say or suggest that M. Ménégos "dissociates religion from" true science, &c.) We arrive at a more arguable point when Mr. Thomas cites Dr. Drummond

as agreeing with M. Ménégos. It seems to me that Dr. Drummond enunciates an entirely different kind of proposition, as we see in the added note, where, after having said that "theological questions may be divided into intellectual and spiritual," and that spiritual truth must be supplied by the religious consciousness, he reminds us that "this position, however, must itself be rationally justified." Suppose that an Agnostic says, "Well, it cannot be rationally justified," I understand that M. Ménégos would reply, "That is a perfectly different matter." ("The certainty of our faith cannot be shaken by science, history or philosophy, because it is raised above all scientific, historic, or philosophic controversies." (*Religion and Theology*, page 38.) Now Dr. Drummond, on the contrary, lays much stress on the faith that the position can be rationally justified. This difference of view is further illustrated by Dr. Drummond on page 47: "Are we, however, to say that the knowledge which always exists in connection with religion is no part of it, but is due merely to the fact that religious feeling exists in beings who are capable of thought, and therefore exercise that thought upon every subject which comes from them? I think not." It will be seen that Dr. Drummond's position is far stronger and more satisfying than that of M. Ménégos, for when the latter has finally stripped away all the "secular" elements (see page 29) of our religious outlook and certitude, if there is anything left it is an indescribable somewhat that has no voice, nor expression, nor affinity with our minds. As Dr. Galloway has said, in treating of Sabatier's "value-judgments," "the heart is *semper varium et mutabile*, and if the verities of religion are apprehended only by inner spiritual experience, universality and consistency of belief appear to be impossible." (*Philosophy of Religion*, page 25.) I know that Mr. Thomas does not agree with me when I say that our author "has his own philosophy after all, and only decries theology and philosophy when they happen to be those of other people." But against this Mr. Thomas only adduces the fact that M. Ménégos does not regard his own (Kantian) philosophy as eternal and absolute truth, and that he holds the doctrine of Darwinian evolution. I submit that there is nothing in this that contradicts my statement. In the remark about "history," also, I must point out that it is *all* history, and not merely fictitious, or external, or miraculous history, that M. Ménégos casts out of our religious consciousness. "History will be a lesson, and a stimulant, a light and a power, but not a pivot" (page 27). Compare with this Dr. Drummond, who, after speaking of "intellectual and spiritual questions," as quoted by Mr. Thomas, adds (page 13): "But many questions are of a mixed kind, and require an intimate co-working of intellectual and spiritual faculty; for instance, the relation in which Christ stands to the human race necessarily rests on an historical basis; and the historical method by itself, if the soul was dead to certain Christian experiences, might lead us astray." It is interesting, by the way, to notice how M. Ménégos puts out of court, without reasoning with him for a

moment, the objector who asks, "What would become of Christianity if it should be proved that Jesus never lived?" (page 45). And yet it is a critical question for his theory. In fact, he has not faced the complexity of the religious consciousness, and takes refuge in an unreal simplification. Finally, Mr. Thomas says that one of my remarks is bathos. Why? He gives no reason. His eye, I am afraid, is still on Gaul. I can but assure him of my sympathy.

W. WHITAKER.

WILLIAM CLARKE.*

WILLIAM CLARKE's many friends will welcome this memorial volume, and will only regret that circumstances should have so long delayed its publication. The collection of well-thought-out articles on a great variety of subjects, together with the interesting sketches of his life and character, will give those who did not know him some idea of the wide range of his knowledge and his strong mental grasp, as well as of his versatility and depth of thought. But they do not and cannot reveal the full powers of the man—his wonderful memory, his effectiveness as a public speaker, or the charm of his conversation when he brought out his rich stores of knowledge, and with apt illustration and humorous by-play compelled conviction by his cogent arguments.

Clarke was not only a facile journalist, able to write quickly and lucidly on almost any topic of history or politics, but a first-class lecturer: one who could marshal his arguments well and drive them home in vigorous language, while his thoughts glowed with the heat of strong and noble emotion. He took honours in History at Cambridge, and History remained his favourite study to the end. He had a quite peculiarly exhaustive knowledge of the constitution and history of the United States, which was, perhaps, exceeded by that of no other Englishman, except the present British Ambassador at Washington. But he was no mere historian, nor did he look at everything from the purely historical point of view. He was able to view political problems from a more elevated standpoint than that of the partisan or hand-to-mouth politician, examining a question in the light of the character of the nation, of facts of history, and geography, of vast world movements, and the germinal ideas of the profoundest political thinkers. These qualities are well shown in the articles here reproduced on Imperialism, Radicalism, and Colonial questions. His firm grip of the real nature of political issues is revealed in the article on the House of Lords, contributed to *The Contemporary Review* in 1899, and included in the present volume. After a masterly analysis of the political temper of the English people which has rendered possible the continuance of the House of Lords for so many centuries, and a scathing exposure of the insincerity of the frequent attacks on that institution by party leaders, he discusses the possibilities of its reform or abolition, and decides for the limitation of

the veto—the plan now favoured by the present Prime Minister—but he insists that "the Lords would not pay any attention to a casual resolution. . . . No, the question of the Lords' veto must be vitally connected with a measure that the people feel to be important, and it must be handled by a Ministry which the people feel to be in earnest."

Clarke was not a specialist in metaphysics, but he had a wide acquaintance with philosophic literature, and was able to treat social questions in the light of great philosophical principles. He was one of the group of thoughtful men whom Thomas Davidson gathered round him, and an original member of the Fellowship of the New Life founded by Davidson, and of the Fabian Society, which grew out of this. His article on "The Industrial Basis of Socialism," reprinted from the "Fabian Essays," is one of the most able and most convincing of those essays, giving the earliest analysis of the evolution of the "Trust" and its place in the development of Socialism. He followed this a few years later by a thoughtful paper on "The Limits of Collectivism," read to the Social Reform Circle of the National Liberal Club. But the essence of his social philosophy is, perhaps, best seen in the following weighty words from a paper on "Aristotle's Politics," read before the Rainbow Circle—a society for the discussion of the basal ideas of Economics and Politics, founded by him in conjunction with Mr. J. Murray Macdonald.

"Now to come to the positive and significant political teaching of the Stagirite. In the first place, this grave investigator, who proceeded by careful induction, and who had before him the entire experience of the Greek world, lays it down as a fundamental principle that the State can only live in the light of a high ideal. This is a lesson indeed to your modern man, who looks on the State as a useful collector of debts, interest on loans, pioneer of commercial aggrandisement, and distributor of doles. The State exists, he says, in order that we may not only live, but that we may live well. He examines the ends that men propose to themselves, and decides that the sole end which justifies the existence of the State is the cultivation of the most virtuous ideal. He is especially critical on the pursuit of riches as the end of the State, and he holds with all Greek thinkers in the best days of Greece that the worst form of government possible is an extreme form of oligarchy or government by the rich in their own interests. From this we may infer what he would have thought of the English or American Government as it really exists to-day. The perfection of life, and nothing less, is the sole end of the State. In laying down this doctrine, Aristotle was expressing the very central thought of the Greek ideal. Hellas aimed at perfection."

A disciple of Emerson and Mazzini could hardly fail to bring to all his speeches and writings the inspiration of a deeply religious spirit, seeing the world as the manifestation of the Over-Soul, and in the march of history the gradual unfolding of a Divine idea. A delicate constitution, injured by overwork and the insidious progress of the disease which finally carried him off at the comparatively early age of forty-nine,

rendered him at times very pessimistic, and led him to indulge his powers of satire in "for" the denunciation of men and measures as "evil or reactionary, but at heart he never lost faith in the spiritual nature of the Universe and the progress of Humanity to ever higher and higher life.

"We have to do not only with that which is," he writes in one of his latest articles, "but with that which ought to be, with art and religion, with the twin ideals of right and beauty, and life will never be rounded and whole, civilisation will never be secure, until these are co-ordinated with that keen desire to know which is the root of our scientific conception of society."

William Clarke was born at Norwich, November 22, 1852. His father was a Lowland Scotchman with Highland blood in his veins, but his mother, from whom he seems to have inherited his literary powers, was English. His sister speaks of him as a somewhat precocious child, fond of books, with a tenacious memory and remarkable reasoning power. Even as a child he cared little for sports, and as a man despised golf and other fashionable games. I remember his quoting to me with gusto the aphorism "Life would be tolerable if it were not for its amusements." From school he went into business, but found it so distasteful that he finally induced his father to send him to college. He graduated at Cambridge University, and remained three or four years in the town, but at length removed to London and earned his living as a journalist.

Mr. Edwin D. Mead, of Boston, had been his fellow-undergraduate at Cambridge, and in 1881 invited him to go to America on a lecturing tour, giving him introductions to the leading men in literature and public life. His lectures were well attended, and on his return to England he became London correspondent for some of the leading American papers. He continued in London for some years in touch with all the advanced movements of the time, and a friend of men like Dr. Martineau and Mr. Stopford Brooke. During this time he wrote many articles for the leading papers and reviews, was on the staff of *The Daily Chronicle* till that paper supported the Boer War, and was constantly speaking and lecturing. Gradually he came to the front in his profession, and at length he was able to leave the turmoil of London, and, hiring the rectory of Grensted, near Ongar, in Essex, he settled down in that quiet village, the little church of which, with walls of solid trunks of oak, dates back to the dim days of Edmund the King and Martyr, and wrote for *The Spectator*, *The Economist*, and *The Manchester Guardian* till, on a holiday in Bosnia with the editors of this volume and other friends, he succumbed to the disease from which he had suffered so long.

I made William Clarke's acquaintance soon after his return from his very successful lecturing tour in America, and was drawn to him by sympathy with his thoroughly democratic ideas and temper, and by his knowledge of America and his appreciation of the great American writers. We grew very friendly, and he came to live next door to me, remaining there about three years. I shall always cherish the remembrance of the long talks we had—of

* "William Clarke: A Collection of His Writings." With a Biographical Sketch by Herbert Burns and John A. Hobson. (Svan Sonnenschein & Co. 420 pp. 7s. 6d.)

Thoreau, Emerson, or Whitman, or of fascinating problems of politics, philosophy, and religion. Sometimes far into the small hours, seated by the slowly dying fire, Clarke would draw upon his wonderful stores of knowledge, or illuminate a subject by his powers of thought, and we would discuss great problems, and see visions and dream dreams of the high future of Man and the divine beauty of the world. Eheu! fugaces.

MAURICE ADAMS

OBITUARY.

MR. W. D. HOUGHTON.

Mr. William Dickson Houghton, J.P., who was for many years prominently identified with the commercial life of Warrington, passed away at his residence, Queen's Lodge, Colwyn Bay, on Friday evening, March 6, at the advanced age of eighty-two. Mr. Houghton suffered in January from a sharp attack of pleurisy, which was followed by a paralytic seizure, and the end was not unexpected.

While resident in Warrington Mr. Houghton devoted much time to municipal affairs, and was a hard working and valued member of the Town Council, and latterly, before he retired to Colwyn Bay, an alderman. He was a Conservative, but did not take an active part in politics. For many years he was a member of the Cairo-street congregation, and it was he who redecored the chapel, at his own cost, during the ministry of the Rev. F. K. Freeston.

MR. THOMAS DAVIES.

We regret to learn of the death of Mr. Thomas Davies, of Blackpool, formerly of Ashton-under-Lyne. He was originally a member of the Dukinfield Old Chapel, but on the formation of the congregation at Ashton, became one of the leaders and most generous supporters of the new movement. He was enrolled as its first member. On the creation of the fund which resulted in the erection of Richmond Hill Chapel, he headed the list with a donation of £100. He subscribed at all times liberally, with no little self-sacrifice. With his death our Ashton friends have lost within a year three of their original committee, men who gave handsomely of their means and services.

VIRTUE may be assailed, but never hurt;
Surprised by unjust force, but not enthralled.

But evil on itself shall back recoil,
And mix no more with goodness. If this fail,

The pillared firmament is rottenness,
And earth's base built on stubble.

Milton.

We have to love God with our strength,
with the might of our will; we have to turn our spiritual sentiments into substance, to worship Him with our energies, with the obedience that subdues all things unto Him—for this it is that brings out the life of heart and soul and mind, the reality in which they culminate.—
J. H. Thom.

THE CHILDREN'S COLUMN.

THE AMERICAN ABOLITIONISTS.

IV.

You have most of you heard of Theodore Parker, who, when he was a very little boy, learnt to listen to the voice of conscience, when it told him not to kill a harmless toad. His mother told him she hoped that he would always listen to this voice, for it was the voice of God speaking in his soul. And he remembered his mother's words, and grew up to be a good and brave man—so brave that he was ready to suffer for what he felt to be right, and true, and to defend the cause of the oppressed. He was a great preacher, and preached against the wickedness of slavery, and stirred up many people in the cause; and when a slave had escaped from his master, and was on his way to find freedom and safety in Canada, Parker was always ready to shelter and protect him, and forward him on his way. On one occasion he wrote his sermon with a pistol beside him, for there was a poor negro hidden in his house, and the slave hunters were in the town searching for him; and Parker, though a peace-loving man, was determined not to give him up, even if he had to fight to defend him. I believe the man got away safely, and so did many another, helped by Parker and others. There was a society called the Underground Railroad, which was not a railway, but a number of people banded together to help the fugitives and pass them on secretly from one to another, till they were safe in Canada.

I must not conclude without telling you something about John Brown, who laid down his life in the cause of the slaves.

He was a farmer in one of the Western states of America—a rugged kind of man, not very scrupulous about the means he used, so that many who sympathised in his aims could not work with him; but his heart was true as steel. He was a loving husband and father, and a deeply religious man. He was filled with burning indignation at the wrongs of the slaves, and thought almost any means lawful to bring about their deliverance. He lived on the borders of a slave state, where quarrels between the slave-holders and the free settlers were not uncommon, and often led to bloodshed. Several times, with a few armed men, he visited the houses of rich slave-holders, and kept them prisoners, while some of his people helped the slaves to escape, and escorted them on their way to Canada. He succeeded several times, without bloodshed; and then the idea occurred to him, that if he could seize the arsenal at Harper's Ferry, in Virginia, so that the whites in that neighbourhood could not get a supply of arms, the slaves would seize the opportunity to escape by hundreds, and would rouse their brethren all over the country.

So he made the attempt in October, 1859, with only fifteen men to support him. It was a rash attempt, and failed. He held the arsenal for a few hours, and then he and his little band were overpowered by a superior force. Two of his sons and a son-in-law were killed or mortally wounded; and he himself was wounded and taken prisoner.

He knew that from the slave-holders he could expect neither justice nor mercy; and

so it proved, for after a trial, which was little more than a mockery, he was condemned to be hanged. But he went bravely and cheerfully to his death, feeling, as he said in a letter, that he was "worth inconceivably more to hang than for any other purpose"—meaning that his death would stir up a feeling of indignation throughout the land, and rouse men's minds, more than he in his life could ever do.

He wrote to his wife and children: "I can trust God with both the time and the manner of my death, believing as I do, that for me to seal my testimony (for God and humanity) with my blood, will do more towards advancing the cause I have earnestly endeavoured to promote than all I have done before. I beseech you all meekly and quietly to submit to this, not feeling yourselves in the least degraded on that account. Remember, dear wife and children, that Jesus of Nazareth suffered a most excruciating death on the cross, as a felon. . . . Think, too, of the crushed millions who have no comfort. I charge you all, never in your trials to forget the griefs of the poor that cry, and of those that have none to help them. . . . I cannot remember a night so dark as to have hindered the coming day, nor a storm so dreadful as to prevent the return of sunshine and a cloudless sky. But, beloved ones, do remember that this is not your rest; that in this world you have no abiding place nor continuing city. To God and his infinite mercy I commend you."

A few weeks later he wrote:—

"I am waiting the hour of my public murder with great composure of mind and cheerfulness, feeling the strong assurance that in no other way could I be used to so much advantage to the cause of good and of humanity, and that nothing that I or my family have suffered or sacrificed will be lost."

And when the day of execution came, he went cheerfully to his death, pausing on his way to the gallows to kiss a little negro-child in its mother's arms.

His enterprise seemed to have failed utterly. Yet Theodore Parker wrote soon afterwards: "The effect is not over, nor ever will be. Brown's little spark was not put out until it had kindled a fire which will burn down much more than far-sighted men look for." And Parker was right. A year or two later came the great struggle between North and South, which led to the overthrow of slavery; and in that war the soldiers of the North marched to the tune of the song which told how "John Brown's body lies mouldering in the grave, but his soul goes marching on."

So John Brown did not die in vain. His brave, faithful life, closed by a martyr's death, helped to bring about the victory of freedom. No faithful life is ever wasted. God will gather up our faithful efforts, and cause them to bear fruit in due time.

M. C. MARTINEAU.

The first part of this paper on the Abolitionists is taken from an article in a review, written long ago, by Harriet Martineau, called "The Martyr Age of America."

The account of John Brown is abridged from "Voices of Nature," by C. A. Martineau.

The Inquirer.

ESTABLISHED 1842.

To all parts of the World:—

	s.	d.
PER QUARTER	1	8
PER HALF-YEAR	3	4
PER YEAR	6	6

One Shilling per year extra will be charged if credit is taken.

Advertisements should reach the office not later than Twelve o'clock on THURSDAY to appear the same week.

All payments in respect to THE INQUIRER to be made to E. KENNEDY, 3, Essex Street, Strand, London, W.C.

LONDON, MARCH 28, 1908.

THE CHURCH FREE AND CATHOLIC.

THE discussion on the condition of our churches, on which we hope for some reply next week from the President of the National Conference, concludes with a selection of letters as miscellaneous in character as the whole series appears in retrospect. We make no comment at the moment, and shall not even attempt to explain to our correspondent who writes this week as a Lancashire business man, what is really meant by the Free Catholic ideal of religious fellowship, on which we are convinced our church life ought to be based. Our object in this article is simply to recall one or two memories.

In the year 1838 there was a great discussion at an aggregate meeting in London on the condition of our churches, and JAMES MARTINEAU came forward as the champion of the larger ideal of religious fellowship. It was in reference to that meeting that JOHN JAMES TAYLER wrote: "The true change, I have long been persuaded, must come from *within*, for the awakening of a deeper and more earnest spirit of religion in the heart of each separate congregation."

In 1865 a proposal was made to give a strict doctrinal definition to the faith of Unitarians in connection with the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. This was defeated, and in the discussion thus occasioned the whole position of the Association was reviewed. It was suggested that the basis of the Association might be so widened as to make it truly representative of the Non-subscribing Churches, but legal as well as other difficulties appear to have stood in the way, and an alternative course was pursued. At the annual meeting in 1867 it was voted by a large majority that the representation of congregations should be abandoned, and the Association became strictly a society of individual subscribers, pledged to the promotion of the principles of Unitarian Christianity. Thus the field was left open for the formation of another union, that should be representative of the Churches, and give expression to their Catholic ideal of unrestricted spiritual fellowship. The short-lived Free Christian Union failed to

provide such a body, but more recently the National Conference has at least laid a working foundation for what is desired. We would commend to our readers in this connection the study of the life of Dr. MARTINEAU, both in Dr. DRUMMOND's and Dr. CARPENTER's volumes, with reference to the years 1838 and 1865-7. It was in 1865 that Dr. MARTINEAU wrote: "For generations to come I see no ark of refuge, no retreat for the Christian spirit which is at once Catholic and intellectual, but our little Church; and we must keep, if we can, the balance true between the width of its thought and the depth of its devotion."

And here we would recall another voice speaking of this great ideal of our Church, to which we will not yet believe that it is too late for us to prove ourselves worthy. At the second meeting of the National Conference, at Birmingham, in 1885, the Rev. R. A. ARMSTRONG was the preacher, and his sermon was on "The Church Free and Catholic." A passage towards the close of that sermon is here reproduced:—

"You of the one sole Church, absolutely Free and Catholic on the face of the earth to-day, I seem, no doubt, to not a few of you to use the language of strange exaggeration. We, we few, we scattered, we unorganised we who do not deem church-going essential, we who mix light-heartedly in the world, *we*, the chosen people on whom is laid that awful, that stupendous responsibility? No, I do not say that we are the chosen people. I have a great fear that we are not worthy. But I say that ours are the chosen principles. And to you, bred in those principles, united in them, strong in them if only you care to be strong, I say the invitation is given to be leaders in that vast regeneration covering the whole of the social sphere, by which alone at last the true brotherhood of our race in sonship and daughterhood to God can touch its blessed realisation.

"And so do I desire with great desire that you men of wealth, of influence, of culture, who are doing so nobly and so generously in the cause of political freedom and equal justice and redemption of the sordid monotony of common life, should perceive that the cause of our Church is your cause too; that with as free a hand as you support every movement which makes for political emancipation or social melioration, you should support every movement promotive of the influence of our Church. And I desire that you, women of refinement, with as pure a devotion as you give yourselves for the education and the comforting of those who are ignorant or in distress, should give yourselves to instilling everywhere religion conceived in these principles of freedom, of veracity, of spirituality, refusing to believe that such service is touched with the sectarian taint. And I desire that you, young men and women, you who are to rule the world to-morrow, you who yet hold in your hand, hardly

impaired, the divine and priceless gift of earthly life, should rise up into consciousness of the magnificence of your heritage in these eternal principles of our Church, and take to yourselves vows of fidelity in the incomparable service to which you are called of God. Above all, I desire that you, fathers and mothers, with the awful, beautiful trust conferred upon you of little children to train for the work which God shall give to them to do, may instil into them loyalty to the sacred principles in which our Church is founded. For I hold that on you who are here to-night, and on your kith and kin up and down the land who are bred in the Freedom and Catholicity of our Church, it depends whether a great and beneficent historic partlies before that Church in the salvation of this nation, or a downfall such as that which belongs to those on whom the voice of God calls aloud, but who are not worthy of the call.

"Yes, truly I am persuaded that if we, this Catholic Free Church of England, shall count for little among the forces which are to bring the great redemption to the earth, it will be, not because our principles are not worthy, but solely because we have not believed in their worth or in their might."

THE second of the special services for boys, arranged by the Committee of the London Battalion Boys' Own Brigade, will be held at Little Portland-st. Chapel, on Thursday evening, April 9, commencing at 8.15. The Rev. J. Page Hopps will conduct the service and deliver the address. Those who are interested in the work among boys in our London churches, and all members of boys' clubs, &c., who can arrange to be present will be very cordially welcomed.

FOR the celebration of Tolstoy's eightieth birthday, Professor Kovalevski has invited co-operation on the part of British admirers. Mr. Laurence Irving, bearing in mind "Tolstoy's entire disapproval of anything like the pompous and expensive parades, or the eulogistic dinners, &c., that usually pass muster as tributes to a great man," makes two suggestions: First, that of a simple pilgrimage to Tolstoy's house at Yasnaya Poliana; and second, that a subscription list should be opened with the object of distributing widespread on Tolstoy's birthday, copies of his later fables and stories. With this latter suggestion Mr. Aylmer Maude cordially agrees, considering that the free gift of the best of Tolstoy's simple stories to the children of primary schools would be of special value. He would like to see Tolstoy's play, "Fruits of Culture" adequately presented in London, and an effort made to bring before English people pictures of which Tolstoy has a high opinion and to which he alludes in "What is Art?" but which are practically unknown here. Mr. Aylmer Maude points out that, though Tolstoy was born on August 28, that date is Russian style, and corresponds to September 10 in our reckoning

OUR GREAT PROBLEM.

DISCUSSION.

SIR,—As the discussion is now being closed, will you permit the undersigned to express the hope that the very important practical proposals put forward by Mr. Weatherall in his letter of March 7, will receive the careful attention of our two leading institutions, the B. & F.U.A. and the National Conference? We cannot but think that the discussion will prove most valuable if it has this result.

W. MELLOR.
F. H. VAUGHAN.
J. WAIN.
W. WHITAKER.

SIR,—A comparison of this discussion with another which was carried on in your columns seven years ago is, on the whole, encouraging. The spiritual obscurantists are still with us in great strength, but they are neither so voluble nor so confident as before. Members of the Church Universal still put forward their grand ideal as a reason for refraining from any effort towards its realisation; opponents of the church idea still try to represent the congregation as a mere aggregate of individuals, like a heap of stones, a conception which only answers to fact when the individuals are mummies, and yet, with a strange inconsistency, they still urge that freedom which organises ceases to be free; that is to say, no society is possible except a society of slaves. These friends of ours are, if they will forgive the phrase, "in other matters sane." They are quite willing to organise for political or social ideals. They recognise the fallacy in other cases, as when a brewery debenture holder, in his passion for temperance, denounces the Licensing Bill. They will even organise for sectarian propaganda; but not, alas, to realise their religion.

On the other hand, the church idea is now accepted and proclaimed, not merely by one or two, but by many. It is working like leaven. Will it leaven the whole lump in time to save it? I begin to hope it may. Meanwhile I, as a sound Unitarian, wish to make a suggestion which some of my fellows will regard, I fear, as rank treason.

We Unitarians profess to champion three causes. First, the philalethian cause, which some call the Open Way and some Non-subscription; secondly, the cause of a pure religion, by which we mean a religion disentangled from discredited history and metaphysic; thirdly, the cause of religious fellowship, the "sympathy of religions," the "church of humanity." We are doing much, even if we could still do much more, in service of all three. We have, of course, a few comrades who are wrong-headed about the first point, but even they are not wrong-hearted. Cause number two has widened out of late to include social service; I do not despair of my Bands of Health. As regards the third cause, we hobnob very socially with Islam, Buddhism, the Brahmo Samaj, the religions of China, and other admirable systems; but there is one which we neglect, to wit, Christendom, and more especially the Christendom of the United Kingdom. Of all folk on earth the

nearest to us are the Congregationalists. Has Conference given the Congregational Union to understand that it wishes to fraternise, to co-operate, is even ready to merge, *salva libertate conscientiae*? And what overtures have we made to the Society of Friends or the Liberal Scottish Churches? or even the Baptists? I know, of course, what you will say, but why *should* we not court rebuffs in so good a cause? Faint heart never won fair lady. Let us woo, and continue to woo, the spirit of fellowship. Who knows if perchance we shall find grace in her sight?

Fuldera.

E. W. LUMMIS.

SIR,—I have hitherto refrained from joining in the discussion for these reasons—that our problem is (for us) so very great, and yet the facts which most clearly show its nature and reveal its magnitude are personal, and would have to be drawn from the actual life of our congregations up and down the country.

But two contributions in your last issue induce me to send a few words. The first is Mr. R. Robinson's, which tells us, concerning two sermons which one of our ministers preached, that "the opposition which they aroused on the part of some members of the congregation contributed largely to the subsequent resignation of his pulpit." I ask, sir, is not this an example of a large class of facts which we must earnestly consider before we can hope to solve our problem? Are not separations of this kind between minister and congregation, as a rule injurious to both—discouraging to the minister, disuniting and discrediting to the congregation? Are they not (or the fear of them, which may be equally injurious) too frequent amongst us? Is there no way in which they can be diminished?

Mr. Worsley Austin's letter suggests, in a few weighty words that we need to be moving towards a higher ideal than "the old-fashioned type of congregationalism." I agree with him, and I hold that the class of facts I have referred to in itself proves the need. Conceivably, of course, disagreements (even to the point of separation) between ministers and congregations, or between sections of a congregation, might always be wisely and honourably managed, even under the system of entire congregational independence. But the very statement of the possibility suggests how great is the difficulty of realising the ideal in practice. The source of the difficulty lies in the fact that all the parties concerned are judges in their own cause. And, of course, the same system offers every temptation to forget that the individual church is a member of a larger body, which inevitably suffers with it. Nevertheless, every part of the body acknowledges the evil, when not blinded by direct interest.

I do not undervalue liberty—I respect the liberty of congregations as much as that of ministers; but I have learned with sorrow (from others' experiences rather than my own) that even in a "free" church under the purely congregational system, not only the minister, not only a minority of the congregation, but even the majority may be deprived of their liberty by a few members who, for one reason or another, hold the key of the position. As Mr. Austin remarks, the thought of a polity

more unifying than pure congregationalism opens up in its turn great problems. But that we are looking into these problems, if only timidly, is a sign of life.

Strangely enough, however, some meet all effort for better organisation with the plea "Life will organise itself." But, there being no such thing as life in the abstract, this can only mean "living beings will organise themselves." Let those who use the abstract phrase make it concrete, and they will see that it turns against them. They must not say sublimely "life will organise itself" if they mean at the same time to cry upon us, "Here are poor dead people trying to organise themselves." As Dr. Momeie said: "One of the most fruitful sources of human error has been the fact that these abstract notions are so frequently taken for actual concrete things." The whole reason of our present dissatisfaction and unrest is that there is life amongst us which is reaching out towards better things.

H. RAWLINGS.

SIR,—I am a business man deeply interested in the welfare and work of our churches, and with an open mind towards any reasonable project for improving the condition of our church life. I regret, however, to have to say that both myself and others known to me fail to find anything satisfying in your ministerial correspondents.

Looking at the organisation side of the question first, I would, as a business man, say, take the foundations already laid for you by the B. and F., and build upon them. Seize all the advantages due to an established position, and the leverage due to goodwill, and expand your business in this way.

If the B. and F. Association has its defects and limitations, then let them be cleared away, and our main organisation expanded to its fullest capacity. Let us have it developed from a mere association of individuals to a body truly representative of the churches. As for the name, that can be made as comprehensive as the name of the Conference itself. And if the ministers don't know how to carry this through, then let the laymen with a business instinct band themselves together and see it through.

But as for the proposal to build up a second organisation with separate funds and officers, making separate appeals to us, I and others would have none of it. It is simply a form of dual control, which is as bad in religion as it is in business. It means rivalries and antagonisms, divided interests and counsels. This is bad enough in a large body, but in a small one it is suicidal.

One central body only we ought to have, truly representative of all, the centre of all our effort, whether deliberative or administrative, with its annual conferences of representatives of the churches, and able, by its position, to wield a moral authority appealing to all. This is the method of every other denomination; it is sensible and businesslike, and I appeal to the Unitarian laity to let matters drift no longer, but see that some such simple plan is carried out.

But I suppose that however comprehensive we made the B. and F., this would not suit our "Free Catholic" friends,

who desire to expunge the name Unitarian altogether as a church designation, and to erect a "Free Catholic Church" instead. This is to them a higher ideal, and they complain that we who object to their ideal are too "practical."

This, however, we resent, and say is not the case. We, too, worship the "Ideal," but it must be a real one, and not a mere combination of empty words and high-sounding phrases.

We are all "free men," nowadays. But what is freedom? It is not a name to place over the door, or another creed to believe in. Not is it a negative attitude, to be adopted in order to allow the odd man in the corner to think his own thoughts (as the "Free Catholic" seems to think).

Surely freedom is infinitely more than all these. It is positive, real, applicable to the body of the church, and to the whole of its organised life. So that if the majority of the members of a church are Unitarians—as they usually are—then they must be free to blend their theology and their religion as they think fit, teach it and propagate it as they desire, purchase literature, class books and hymn books, and engage a minister of their own theological kind—in fact, to do collectively whatsoever the spirit within the body moves them to do. Unless a church can act in this manner, it is not *free* fundamentally, and no name over the door will make it so.

Such a church would be, as a matter of fact, a Unitarian Church, and it would be so as the inevitable result of its freedom. Whether it called itself so or not, it would be so; and so, to deny itself as a body, organised action in the manner in which each separate individual would like to go, is to stultify its own religious life, and to do so merely because of the odd Trinitarian in one corner and the odd agnostic in the other, and a possible convert looming on the distant horizon, is a foolishness of which we have been guilty too long.

This is, however, no infringement of our Free Trusts, but a necessary consequence of them. We are free for the present to hold collectively any theology we like, but not to bind our successors, and that is surely what our Free Trusts mean. The idea of the Free Catholic, however, seems to be that we are never to be free to-day for fear of to-morrow. He makes the mistake of identifying freedom with one particular aspect of it.

Your correspondents seem clearly to base their whole case upon this false assumption that earnest religious men can somehow separate their theology from their religion, and whilst keeping the former as a private luxury, can still proceed to live a common religious life together, as if the theology had no relationship to it. This can never be; and though we may refrain from dogmatism, and repress violent antagonisms, we shall never make a body of religious men any different as a whole than they are individually. And we ought not to desire it or be impatient with it, because to do so is not to be "Catholic," but the reverse. It is the negation of real freedom.

JOS. ENTWISTLE.

Bolton, March 23, 1908.

SIR,—Two considerations appear to me to be involved in this discussion which require a distinct statement—(1) organisation, and (2) the religious life.

(1) The organisation, which seems to be the immediate cause of the controversy, aims at some form of ecclesiasticism and some form of church "discipline" at present unknown amongst us. This assumed necessity brings the Conference into antagonism with the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. Such a conflict is surely as unnecessary as it is unfortunate and no real good is likely to issue from it. To attain any such end is to revolutionise two institutions without any sufficient warranty in actual facts. For first the Conference is to be changed into a financial institution, and then the British and Foreign Unitarian Association rendered in some sense subordinate to the Conference.

The facts of the case do not seem to require any such drastic change. For there is no practical difficulty in reconciling the functions of the Conference with those of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. Theoretically, of course, there is a difficulty in that the latter is not representative. This, however, is only felt in the abstract; in the concrete the Association is in touch and co-operation with almost all the other financial institutions that are representative. And, so far as I have heard or known, there is the fullest agreement between the Association and the several local Associations, with only this difference—that the Society that is administered from London does not limit its activities to the British Isles. And I don't suppose that anyone desires it should. No one suggests that the functions of the local Associations should cease or be absorbed into some central body, or even overruled by such a central society. A new financial institution does not, therefore, appear to be necessary, and, if established, could only injure more or less seriously the local Unions. And it seems plain enough that our public does not feel the need for any such step; and that feeling seems to me to rest upon a sound judgment of existing facts and needs.

The proper work of the Conference is deliberation and stimulus, which it supplies by intercourse and the discussion of living issues. This is the feeling that has dominated the Conference, and ought to dominate it. In the past, and surely in the future, the Conference may deal with a financial matter that is concerned with a real need; and then in the past, and, doubtless, in the future, the people will respond freely and generously. But when the Conference declined to administer the funds itself had brought into existence, it wisely declined to administer them, and handed them over to an independent body. There is no question that these funds are well administered. Nothing would be gained, and possibly something might be lost, by placing them under the control of the Conference.

It is, however, contended that there is a principle at stake, and the matter must be fought out under that august name. Well, perhaps there is, but the principle is not all on one side by any means. On the one side the change suggested spells ecclesiasticism in some form—a mild form, it may be—but in some form the thing is

there. The principle is granted. But such a thing in any form is opposed to the genius and essential spirit of our movement, and will doubtless be opposed on "principle" that has its roots in our historic evolution. If we try to reconcile the spirit of essential freedom with that of central control, with "authority," we are only trying to make inclusive terms and things that are mutually exclusive, and are no more likely to succeed in practical manipulations than we are in logic. We must recognise our limitations. If we were dealing with spacial relations merely, we might build perhaps according to our fancy, but in existing circumstances we cannot do what we would.

From this point of view, then, our "Great Problem" is how to win the life and energy that will enable us to make the most of the institutions we already possess.

(2) The second point is the more serious, as it is the more vital. How can we deepen and strengthen the religious life and spirit amongst us, so that we may be able to do a more effective work for ourselves and our neighbours?

One suggestion is that we change our name. One of your correspondents has suggested that if we had had another name the New Theology men would have come over to us in a body. That, however, is only a pious opinion, and must remain in the air. Against it has to be set the fact that in all cases where our position has been adopted with the careful exclusion of the name, the success has only been temporary and mostly personal, followed later by most dismal failure.

This undoubted fact suggests the utter inadequacy of any such means, even if they were in our power to employ, which they are not. The real cause must lie far deeper than any question of change of name or organisation. What this deeper cause is there may well be more than one opinion about. Yet, so far as I can see, the case is clear enough. That form of religious experience which commends itself to us and is for us the bread of life is not common enough to be popular, and is not likely to be yet awhile. The undogmatic temper, the judgment more or less in suspense, the open mind, the persistent quest of truth, are for us vital, but for most men intolerable. Many who see the truth and feel the beauty of the ideal do not feel called upon to make the sacrifice their realisation requires. Those who can and will must, in the nature of things, be a minority. Those who take such a straightened way are likely to be a somewhat lonely company. But we can take no other; for us it is the way of life. Such is the insoluble logic of fact. We would take the world into our arms, the world declines to be embraced by us. There is only one thing left for us to do—measure our ambitions by our powers, and by attempting less we may accomplish more.

R. H. LAMBLEY.

Horwich, March 19, 1908.

SIR,—The unsatisfactory condition of many of our smaller churches has touched the sympathetic heart of the Rev. Joseph Wood and others acquainted with the state of the case. One would like to have heard more from the representatives of these

weak and struggling congregations, for surely this is the pivot on which the whole question turns. Anxiety, blame and wretchedness are the ingredients that make their cup bitter as aloes.

It may be that those who plead for thorough organisation and the linking-up of our scattered units into one body or church as rational and business-like, and likely to bring relief where most needed, will fail to impress deeply the other side. Nevertheless, it is well that their honest convictions should be duly chronicled, for the end is not yet.

Is there not valid reason for lodging an objection against the oft-repeated "Where Dr. Martineau failed &c." ? Such a line of argument sounds strange from those who believe in the open vision and march of intellect. Why, sir, where the giant of yesterday experienced defeat, the child of to-day may meet with success.

But did Dr. Martineau fail ? Or did that wonderfully luminous, alert, and fine intellect correctly gauge the situation, and give the lead demanded by the nature of the problem ? Some of us earnestly desire that his incomparable judgment may yet be honoured by his remedy being allowed to operate "in the dark places of our guilt and woe."

Unitarianism, we are told, is a "movement." As such, has it been a success ? The answer might be given honestly in the affirmative. But something more than this fluid state is required if we are to take root and prosper as a religious community. Is there any good reason why we should not try to become a church (plus a movement if you like), and as such woo the support of the world ? Of course, a church presupposes some kind of theology. Here we are afraid of committing ourselves, and are needlessly nervous of getting cornered. As independent units we publish our affirmations, yet, truth to tell, and all honour to the fount, they usually all emanate from the same source. Why could we not do so as one body ? Unbridled freedom would seem to be our greatest misfortune, and has made possible the innocent-looking wooden horse—Free Catholic—which now threatens our Troy with final ruin. A united Unitarian Church also can save the city.

Why should we despair of framing a constitution, defining our position, and setting up a steady spiritual light ? The command is "Let your light shine," and the demand of the age is for definite and duly accredited statements. We have, we know, philosophers and wise men in our midst who can analyse, pick to the bone, and pierce to the marrow of things. Might they not prove equal to a great synthetic emergency ?

Surely no sane Socialist would object to all our congregations being bound together in the bundle of life, through a common organisation, a common exchequer, and common self-denial, in the highest interests of the faith of which we are the custodians.

We talk much of the unity of the spirit. I submit, sir, where in all sincerity and truth that unity exists it will seek to descend from its starry heights and reveal itself in a chaste, harmonious and palpable body.

WILLIAM LINDSAY.

9, Belle Vue-park, Sunderland.
March 24, 1908.

SIR,—At the eleventh hour I send a few remarks *re* this discussion. Some ten years' association with the so-called Unitarian Church has revealed to me, as it has also to others, that the two chief sources of weakness are (1) the lack of real interest and enthusiasm amongst its individual members for church worship, and (2) the need of a definite statement of belief to which all those applying for membership should at least assent to. I need scarcely point out that there is all the difference in the world between "a belief" and "a creed." Freedom of thought is possible with the one, but not with the other. Now it has frequently been urged by outside critics that Unitarians are constantly changing their ground, and further that Unitarianism is often only "a half-way house" towards Agnosticism. These points were insisted on by friends who knew I had "gone over."

Now such assertions as these ought not to be possible. It should be quite clearly known to the world that the Unitarian churches, although undogmatic, *do* stand for definite *doctrines*. I maintain that the very name of "church," as distinguished from the "temple" of the ancients, implies the following beliefs:—(1) God, (2) His Holy Spirit, (3) Our Lord Jesus Christ, (4) The Soul, and (5) Immortality. No "church" is possible without these fundamentals, therefore, membership should entail an assent to these beliefs. A real "lively faith" in the above essentials is what is wanted in all the churches. It would be a bulwark of untold strength. Compared to the need of this faith, the question of organisation is a mere bubble that may be allowed to drift away on the breeze. Organisation will speedily follow a Pentecost in our midst.

"Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together," was the injunction of the great Apostle. We should to-day meet in our churches for *worship* in the prayerful spirit of the beautiful invocation I quote:

"Come to aid the souls who yearn
More of truth divine to learn,
And with deeper love to burn;
Hear us, O our Father.

Keep us in the narrow way,
Warn us when we go astray,
Plead within us when we pray;
Hear us, O our Father."

A brief word as to the name "Unitarian." I am glad to know, sir, that you favour the appellation "The Free Catholic." If a discussion waged for fifty years a better name could not be found. It is an inclusive title for all shades of Christian faith, and, moreover, it embraces an ideal that is destined eventually to be realised throughout Christendom.

HEDLEY VICARS.

Bristol, March 24, 1908.

SIR,—It has fallen to my lot during the past two years to give instruction in (amongst other subjects) what is known in schools as "Religious Knowledge" to boys of from eleven years of age upwards. Our text-book is the Bible. It seems to be admirably suited for the purpose, and yet I sometimes have serious misgivings as to whether I ought to be using the book at all. Were its value such as I conceive it to be, I cannot understand how boys can

come here in such amazing ignorance, not only of the chief characters and incidents of the Bible, but of the very titles of the books, and their position in the canon. I will not ask for space to quote instances (laughable, were they not pitiful) of the ignorance in question, but will simply state that it is only less in the case of the New Testament than the Old.

The bearing of this on the present discussion is as follows:—These boys come, in many cases, from families calling themselves Unitarian. Is it to be inferred that Unitarianism, as implying the negation of a certain doctrine, carries negation in other directions too, and will have nothing to do with any of the religious equipment of those who profess the said doctrine ? Is the Bible being superseded ? If so, by what ? Or, if it is not discarded, is its use to be as sparing as possible ? and, in particular, is it to be a closed book to the young ? Again, if the Book of Common Prayer happens to contain creeds, does it necessarily follow that the undoctinal portions, despite all their dignity and beauty, are worthless ? Or, to refer to a somewhat different matter, if a certain standard of reverence is observed by Trinitarians in their places of worship, even when divine service is not in progress, are Unitarians required to abandon that standard as at least unnecessary ? Surely it were better to have no name at all than one that should seem to demand such sacrifices !

If, on the other hand, there is a positive reality to which the negative title "Unitarianism" has, unhappily, become attached—and there are those who, sick of denying creeds and tilting at fancied opponents, believe in that reality, and desire in some sort to let it influence their lives—then what is needed is not a misleading negation, but a name of positive import synonymous or, rather, identical with that of Christianity itself.

H. L. JONES.

Willaston School.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[The Editor is not responsible for the opinions expressed by correspondents. LETTERS CANNOT BE INSERTED WITHOUT THE WRITER'S NAME, and all private information should be accompanied by the name and address of the senders.]

LICENSING REFORM.

SIR,—I do not think the contention which you say has been advanced by "trade" advocates, viz., that intemperance is not directly affected by the facilities afforded, should be brushed aside so lightly as it is by you in your leading article. I have before me a list, compiled some years ago, of the counties of England and Wales, with the proportion of public houses to population, and the proportion of persons to population proceeded against for drunkenness, in each county, and the figures certainly show that there is a good deal to be said for the "contention."

Huntingdonshire stands first in the number of public houses, having 1 to 97 inhabitants; in drunkenness it is forty-seventh. Cambridgeshire is second in public-houses, fifty-first in drunkenness. Northamptonshire is twelfth in public-houses, fifty-fourth and lowest in drunken-

ness. (Yorkshire is divided into its three Ridings in the tables, making 54 counties in all.) On the other hand, Northumberland is forty-eighth in public houses, first in drunkenness, Cheshire forty-fifth in public houses, tenth in drunkenness. Lancashire forty-second in public-houses, third in drunkenness. Of course, there are some that show the opposite result, but the bias is preponderatingly in favour of what you call the contention of the "trade."

Now I know it may be said that these figures do not prove much, as the conditions of employment must be taken into account, and that no one would expect to find the same amount of drunkenness in agricultural Cambridgeshire as in mining and shipbuilding Northumberland. Well, I agree, but that amounts to saying that it is the class of work which causes drunkenness, and not the number of public-houses. Otherwise we should certainly have expected that Cambridgeshire, with [nearly two and-a-half times the proportion of public houses to population, would outstrip Northumberland in drunkenness, whereas Northumberland leads by thirteen to one.

Also, it may be said that the authorities may be much more strict in some counties than in others, and that therefore the figures again are of little value. But we have no means of knowing which are the strict counties and which are the slack ones, and it may be assumed that the average is fairly struck by the figures as we have them. It is quite certain that if the figures tended in the opposite direction temperance reformers would accept them as conclusive evidence on their side. Your remark at the end of the same paragraph as to there being less drinking with fewer licences is scarcely to the point. It is no a question of drinking, but of drunkenness. And I think the figures from which I have taken the above instances claim more credence than your grudging "it is possible that such cases, or some of them, are as stated."

J. M. GIMSON.

Leicester, March 24, 1908.

[There is another consideration, to which our correspondent does not refer, but without which the figures as to the relative number of public-houses in a county seem to us of very little value,—and that is, of what character are the houses? For instance, in Huntingdonshire, what proportion of the many houses are village taverns, or little wayside inns, and in Northumberland, how many are flaring gin palaces in the midst of a crowded population?—ED. INQ.]

SIR,—As your issue of the 21st inst. contains so much letterpress in favour of Mr. Asquith's Bill, can you find space for some remarks from one who being unconnected with the brewing interest or any public-house, honestly believes that if the Bill became law it would do more harm than good? It is right to discuss the question, although, as I believe, the Bill is repugnant to the wishes of the large majority of the nation, and will accordingly be thrown out by the House of Lords. In your leader, you say that the brewers declare that the Bill will "do nothing for temperance" and also that their business will be

"ruined." I do not think these statements inconsistent. The brewers may be ruined if their property be rendered of much less market value than hitherto, and those who read the letter of Sir William Dupree in *The Times* of the 13th inst., cannot doubt that such diminution would take, in fact, has already taken, place. The Government sold to Sir William Dupree a licensed house for £10,000, the reserve price, apparently; they then brought in their Bill, and the Government valuers thereupon valued the property at £2,500, a quarter of the sum the Government received for it. As to the diminution of drinking, I am not aware that it has been shown that drunkenness has diminished where the number of licences has been reduced, whilst on the other hand, instances have been given where there have been fewer licences and more drinking; unless the contrary can be shown, the reduction of licences would seem to be valueless. The labouring man is already threatening to have a barrel in his own house, and there is too much reason to fear that in that case drinking would be more continuous than at present. The risk of losing the licence is a strong incentive, which the Bill would greatly lessen, to conduct the public-house well, and we know that large profits can be made without excessive drinking. I am unable to see why there should not be licensed victuallers, the well-conducted public-house being a comfort to the poor man, although of no use to me. I think also that a tradesman should be able to acquire a goodwill in his trade, and this the licensed victualler can hardly do if, without fault on his part, he is liable to be at any time deprived of his licence without compensation. With respect to a remark by one of your correspondents, I am told, on reliable authority, that many companies write very largely off their properties each year, which is considered to be in itself a reserve, and that Messrs. Whitbread have done this. I am thankful that temperance, by which I mean the absence of excessive drinking, seems steadily to increase, and no one should drink any intoxicant unless considered beneficial, but I believe that gradual change is far more likely to be permanent than the drastic methods which the Bill proposes, and we may reasonably conclude that if the State be benefited as proposed at the expense of the trade, other property will be treated in like manner, and no investments will long be safe. It is true that in such a cause "sacrifice" would be admirable if there were good reason to think the desired end would be thereby attained, but the public would be benefited and the sacrifice should be theirs.

DENNIS B. SQUIRE.

Lymebourne, Sidmouth, March 24, 1908.

SIR,—Mr. Grundy cannot be well acquainted with Norwich, or he would not quote the number of public houses in that city in support of his statement that "it is well known that there is no connection to be traced between a reduced number of licensed houses and a decrease of drunkenness." Not only the number but the character of the houses must be taken into account. In Norwich there are many public houses in close proximity

in squalid neighbourhoods, and all of them cheerless and uninviting. Ten such houses, situated as they are, are not so great an attraction as one flaring gin palace in a main street. Perhaps the same applies to Liverpool and Glasgow, which Mr. Grundy quotes, the new licences having been granted in busier quarters, and to more imposing and better lighted houses. Brewers know that the style of the houses and the district in which they are situated are of far more importance than numbers. More than once I have seen two and three old licences offered to the magistrates by brewers in return for one in a growing suburb. Other things also have to be considered when statistics about drunkenness are quoted. What are the wages paid in the district—those in Norwich are low? What is the constitution of the Watch Committee, and what is its attitude towards the liquor traffic? I was told the other day that the great number of convictions in Middlesbrough, which Mr. Grundy quotes against Norwich, is due to the zeal of one individual, who is determined to diminish the evil in that centre.

As a matter of psychology I think we must admit that it is more difficult for a man with drinking propensities to pass six well-lighted public houses than one. It would certainly prove detrimental to the worth of the present Bill, if Mr. Grundy or some other could definitely demonstrate that there is no connection between a reduced number of licensed houses and a decrease in drunkenness. Norwich has been too often quoted to prove this. It was quoted in the House of Commons by the late Sir Harry Bullard, who must have known it was not to the point. It has been mentioned lately by speakers, who in almost the same breath have asserted that the wholesale reduction of licensed houses which the Bill would bring about, would mean the ruin of an important trade.—

ALFRED HALL.

48, St. George's terrace,
Newcastle-on-Tyne.

SIR,—Mr. Montgomery's letter is one of the most valuable contributions on the argumentative side of this controversy that I have seen. It provides supporters of the Government's "time limit" proposals with an armoury of fact, and fact, I suppose, is still stronger than falsehood.

But in quoting figures of this kind to opponents one has to give one's authority: and Mr. Montgomery's statement as to the manner of valuing licences would be still more useful if he would tell us on what authority he speaks, whether from experience in some professional capacity, or from some technical or official publication.

I presume the method described is that in vogue before Mr. Balfour's Act came into force. Any value added to the licence by this Act was, of course, discounted by the declaration made at the time from the front opposition bench, that a time limit would be imposed when the Liberal party should return to power.

F. EDWIN ARMSTRONG.

Tinsley Park, near Sheffield.

PROVINCIAL LETTER.

THE NORTH MIDLANDS.

It is, I believe, one of the priceless perquisites of a Provincial Letter writer to be allowed to talk recklessly and at large of whatever may come into his devoted head. Whatever an editor, oppressed by the weight of "Our Great Problem," may think, this will be recognised by every irresponsible reader of these columns as an immensely important privilege which can best be indulged by ambling aimlessly among soothing and conciliatory themes. One might, for instance, touch on tigers, but this is too savage a subject for a peace-loving writer like myself, and I leave the topic to men of carnivorous and predatory instincts. Then there is free-will with its many follies and fascinations, but it is apt to prove inflammatory, and it can only be safely handled by professors and fallen angels. In the search for really genial and unprovocative subjects we are thus obviously reduced to Socialism and the blessed word Mesopotamia, sometimes spelt Unitarian. Let us therefore turn at once to the more pacifying of these two, namely, Socialism.

The great problem is, what is to become of the churches—not "our" churches merely, but all churches. We have contemplated without dismay the disruption of orthodoxy in Romanism, Anglicanism, and Evangelical Nonconformity. We have thought, possibly, that this meant more grist to our particular mill. At any rate, it has meant more water over our wheel. A new stream is undoubtedly trickling, however, slowly, into our pond, but the great volume of liberal thought is finding its way to the sea along other than the recognised channels. Here, indeed, is the difficulty. It was delightful to see the rapid destruction of dogma, and watch the pieces fly; but delight is changing into misgiving and anxiety when we begin to suspect that the forces that are destroying ecclesiastical dogma are proceeding also to destroy ecclesiastical organisations, and will not stop until they have demolished all that we now understand by "churches." The spirit that is disintegrating the creeds is having a dissolving effect on the church-idea itself. It is with the churches pretty much as with foreign missions. The modern mind asks, What is the particular use of them? It may be that the men who have ceased to take the missionary seriously as a bearer of the Cross are still shrewd enough to recognise that he has his good points as the herald of the Union Jack. First missionary, afterwards merchant, and then the big guns, as the old native chief said. This cynical or sincere shifting of the emphasis from next-worldliness to this-worldliness accounts in some measure for the desertion of the churches. Men have heard a great deal about "practical" religion, and at last they begin to take the phrase in earnest. They submit piety itself to a pragmatic and even utilitarian test. What difference does your religion or your church make to our social conditions? And is your religion seen at its manliest and sincerest in a church? When you have removed so effectually the horror of hell, the allurements of heaven, and all present ecclesiastical discipline, what particular superiority has your church

over the open air or the Socialist meeting? Which means most intensely to the mass—"dearly beloved brethren" or "Comrades"? Are we quite aware of the fact that the labouring and "lower" orders, as distinct from the comfortable classes, are oppressed to the point of tragedy by the social problems of this world's life? The vision of the church is wavering, indistinct, or altogether unreal to the oppressed, the sweated, the unemployed. Christianity had, at least, a consolatory message for the slave population of the Empire. It cannot now sincerely repeat that message in so far as it was merely eschatological and next-worldly. Nor can it speak convincingly to our modern slaves of holiness in this life. What precisely does holiness mean to the clever "out-of-work" who has gone through a complete course of *Clarion* literature? Brotherhood he can understand, but he has not found it in the church; and he thinks that all our talk about it is a nauseous insincerity. Social justice he can understand, but he sees very little of its reality in the conditions of his life; and he has heard only vague and abstract platitudes about it in the church. What, then, in terms of practical life, is holiness? Is it something Pauline and far away, like election or justification?

These are some of the disquieting questions that are being asked of respectable church-goers by men who see in the Church only an upper and middle-class institution for buttressing and "sanctifying" privileges that do not seem to belong to any very brotherly arrangement.

I believe the earnest artisan of our day has a tolerably clear idea of the Kingdom of God, probably a clearer idea of it than the priests and the lawyers, even as another earnest artisan had nearly 2,000 years ago. He sees that this idea may yet have an immense effect on the development of society. But he feels that the essential spirit of Jesus has passed beyond the churches, and means something for the workers of to-day and to-morrow that it has never meant before for the world. That is why the taxation of land values is felt by many sincere minds to be more relevant to the Kingdom of God than, for example, the doctrine of the Trinity. That is why the hope of a new social order is becoming such a striking parallel to the hope of the Messianic Kingdom in the time of Jesus, and is meeting with a similarly vehement opposition from the wealthy and governing classes. That, too, is why the workers prefer to contribute towards labour organisations and the salaries of Labour Members of Parliament than towards the churches and the salaries of professional preachers whom they regard as the private chaplains of the well-to-do who claim without any sense of disgust or disgrace that those who pay the piper have a right to call the time.

The great problem, then, is not a mere problem of "our" churches as distinct from other churches. As pioneers our churches are, perhaps, for the moment feeling the keenness and the urgency of the modern spirit more sensitively and truthfully than other churches. We have not the art of weaving a veil of deception between ourselves and reality. But, as a matter of fact, the decay of organised religion is even more conspicuous in other

denominations than in our own. Only we take the public into our confidence and discuss the situation openly, and this, let us flatter ourselves, is a sign of courage and of grace. The other denominations, however, try to keep a prudent and politic silence about the desperate condition of their own affairs. They will go on trading after they have discovered their own insolvency. In this way our frank communicativeness in comparison with their shrewd reticence conveys an exaggerated impression of our difficulties. What the eye does not see the heart does not grieve. We know our own sore and our own grief, and we talk about it on the housetops, in the eye of the sun, and in the face of all Israel. We do not know about the plague that has smitten the Canaanites. Now and again a candid Anglican will blurt out the truth about the Established Church, its intolerable strain, and its failure to attract candidates for Holy Orders. A modernist in like manner will betray the enormous and increasing collapse in the Roman Church, its rapid enfeeblement through the secession or excommunication of some of its most cultivated and critical minds. And the Rev. R. J. Campbell, in what is his best and boldest work, "Christianity and the Social Order," straps down Evangelical Nonconformity to the table and proceeds to vivisection it without anaesthetics, so that the squealing thereof is heard far and wide. Let us change a disagreeable metaphor, and say that a more ruthless exposure of a lath painted to look like iron was never offered to the religious public. We may deplore our weakness; we may recognise the futility of this *tu quoque* retort still, our particular prospect is not hopeless. After many of the big barques shall have been wrecked in the tempest our little cockle, shell will probably be found still riding the waves. I wonder!

Our churches in the North Midlands retain, on the whole, their former position. One or two are in that state of abject melancholy which is usually described in the reports as full of hope for the future. Others are pushing ahead with some vigour, and are full of cheer for the present. The congregation of the Old Meeting, Mansfield, inspired by their energetic leader, the Rev. F. H. Vaughan, are busy with good works. Extensive building and structural alterations in chapel and school, at the expense of several hundreds of pounds, are now practically completed. Several new members have joined the congregation. The institute, which is a special pet of the minister, has established itself, and proved an attraction to the young people. A breeze of health and confidence seems to blow about the place, bringing an assurance of prosperity and progress.

Since last I wrote a Provincial Letter, Friar Gate Chapel, Derby, has completed important building improvements at considerable cost. It is to be hoped that the Rev. Lang Buckland will remain to guide the congregation to further success. Christ Church, Nottingham, has come safely through the agony of a three days' bazaar, with a snug little sum of money in hand as a reward for its plucky enterprise. Hinckley makes a steady advance under the ministry of the Rev. T. J. Jenkins. The

Loughborough and Ilkeston joint scheme retains the invaluable services of the Rev. W. H. Burgess, who to his many self-sacrificing labours adds those of commander-in-chief to the lay preachers of the district. But for the able ministry of the Lay Preachers' Union we should long ago have had to surrender some of our outposts.

Our interests at Gainsborough have recently received careful attention. New trustees have been appointed, and, with the aid of a substantial local endowment, it is hoped shortly to complete arrangements for the settlement of a minister.

The movement at Burton-on-Trent is significant in the light of some of the considerations already advanced in this letter. The friends there were always keenly interested in the modern movement for social reform, and have now passed over to the Labour church. May they prosper with their new allies, and continue to preach the gospel of the Kingdom, albeit in another dialect.

At Coalville we have an earnest and enthusiastic band of some fifteen Unitarians, who are working with exemplary zeal. They are now in a critical condition, owing to the difficulty of securing a suitable place of meeting. They deserve every assistance and encouragement. Should they now fail to get adequate support, one of the most promising of recent movements in the North Midlands will have repeated the story of Shirebrook, and gone to swell the statistics of infant mortality.

The most memorable event of the year will be the visit of the President of the National Conference to the district in the autumn. We can assure Mr. Wood that he will receive a warm-hearted and popular welcome, not only for his own genial self's sake, but in admiring recognition of his magnificent labours for our churches at large. We know with what resolute and large-minded purpose he has given himself to the service of our people, and our appreciation of his self-forgetting devotion is deep and sincere.

J. M. LLOYD THOMAS.

In his recent lecture at Glasgow, under the auspices of the Scottish Christian Social Union, Dr. Hunter dealt with the evils which inevitably follow from the modern mode of life in cities. Those who toiled in the heart of the city all day, at night often travelled far out to a quiet and healthy circumference, where they were in great danger of burying themselves in selfish indifference to the evils which they had helped to create. Suburban life as at present organised tended to accentuate the gulf between rich and poor. Cities ought not to be sacrificed to passing hordes whose object it was to make all they could out of them and then abandon the places they had made ugly and mean. They needed a loyal devotion to their city, to work for it, to serve it, and enrich it with the best they had to give. They had to engage in a crusade nobler than any of the middle ages, to wrest Glasgow from oppression, poverty, intemperance, and vice, and to bring in the opportunity for a fair and happy and honourable life.

NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES.

[Notices and Reports for this Department should be as brief as possible, and be sent in by Wednesday, or Thursday Morning at latest.]

Belfast: Stanhope Street Domestic Mission.—The annual meeting of subscribers and friends of this Mission was held in the Central Hall, Rosemary-street, on Monday evening, March 9, when there was a good attendance, notwithstanding weather of the severest description. The chair was taken by the Rev. H. J. Rossington, who, in moving the adoption of the reports and statement of accounts, referred to the great regret with which he heard the announcement of the impending retirement of the missionary, the Rev. Eustace Thompson. An able and interesting address was given by Rev. H. D. Roberts, of Hope-street Church, Liverpool, who also, as special preacher on the previous Sunday, had spoken effectively on behalf of the Mission and its work. A resolution expressing heartfelt recognition of Mr. Thompson's untiring services was carried by acclamation. The committee for the ensuing year have now to deal with the question of finding a successor.

Bristol: Lewin's Mead Domestic Mission.—The annual meeting was held on Monday evening, March 23, the president, Mr. P. J. Worsley, in the chair. A hearty welcome was accorded to the new missionary, Mr. Thomas Graham, and his sister, and Mr. Graham reported on the eight months during which he had been engaged in the work. He referred to the regret which had been felt when Mrs. Broadrick was obliged to relinquish the work, and to the help rendered by Mr. J. Kendrick Champion, the treasurer, during the interregnum. He reported good progress in the work. The committee's report, read by Professor Sibree, expressed satisfaction at Mr. Graham's settlement. The treasurer reported eighteen new subscribers and a small balance in hand. On the motion of the chairman, seconded by Mr. W. Hall, the reports were adopted. A resolution of cordial welcome to Mr. and Miss Graham, moved from the chair, was seconded by the Rev. A. N. Blatchford, and acknowledged by Mr. Graham. The Revs. A. N. Blatchford and E. I. Fripp, and Mr. Graham were thanked for their sermons in support of the mission on Sunday, the officers were elected, and votes of thanks to all helpers and to the president brought the meeting to a close.

Burnley.—A tablet to the memory of the late Alderman James Bibby was unveiled in the Trafalgar-street Church last Sunday afternoon, and, prior to the service in the church, there was a crowded gathering in the lecture room, where portraits of three of the founders of the church—Mr. William Sagar, Mr. Peter Bibby, and Alderman Bibby—were unveiled. Mr. William Marsden presided. The portrait of Mr. Sagar was unveiled by his grandson, of the same name. Mr. Matthew Jobling, in unveiling the portrait of Mr. Peter Bibby, told of the migration of his family fifty years ago from Padiham to Burnley, and of their faithfulness in walking over on Sundays to Nazareth Chapel, and then of the part they took in the founding of the church at Burnley. Mr. P. J. Hargreaves accepted the portraits on behalf of the congregation. The portrait of Alderman Bibby, unveiled by Mr. John Farrer, was a tribute from the Sunday-school. Mr. J. T. Bibby, speaking on behalf of the family, gratefully acknowledged the tribute they had paid to his late father. In the church, Mr. J. S. Mackie unveiled the tablet, the Rev. J. M. Whiteman presiding. In the course of a warm tribute to the memory of his friend and fellow-superintendent in the Sunday-school for many years, Mr. Mackie said that James Bibby had held a unique position in connection with that church and school. "I found him," said Mr. Mackie, "ever the same—genial, kindly, considerate, helpful, unassuming, patient, long-suffering, slow to anger;—a wise counsellor, a faithful friend, a convinced and devoted Unitarian, a zealous Sunday-school worker, a true lover of his church;—religious in the best sense of the word. His connection with the Sunday-school must have extended over more than 45 years. For nearly 20 years of that time he was a teacher, and it ought to be mentioned—a fact possibly not known to many—that for a great part of that time he taught every Sunday, morning and afternoon.

It was my good fortune to be associated with him for many years as his colleague at the superintendent's desk. And I can truly say that never had any man a better colleague than he—ever willing to do duty, ever willing to fill a gap. I believe he was prouder of his office of superintendent of our school than of any of the many distinctions that came to him outside. But it was the noblest sort of pride—without a trace of ambition or self-seeking in it. We who knew him best knew how ready he always was to take the lowest place and to fulfil the humblest duty. He was the president of our Church for many years; so long as he lived we could think of no other occupant of the chair at our meetings. It seemed to be his position by a kind of divine right, which no one ever dreamt of disputing. It was his prerogative—a tribute won from his fellows by his capacity for affairs, by his comradeship, and by his constant solicitude for the well-being both of the Church, and of the great cause which our Church represents."

Derby (Resignation).—At a well-attended meeting of the Friargate congregation on Monday, March 23, a resolution was unanimously adopted, accepting with profound regret the resignation of the Rev. E. S. Lang Buckland, with expressions of high personal regard and gratitude for his services to the congregation and hearty good wishes for the future.

Halifax.—The Northgate End Chapel, after being closed for renovation and alterations, was re-opened on Sunday, March 22. Electric light has been installed, and the organ has also been renovated and thoroughly re-modelled. The total cost of the improvements will probably be between £400 and £500. For the re-opening services there were large congregations, and the transformation of the chapel was very favourably commented upon. The preacher, morning and evening, was Principal Gordon, of Manchester. At each service the choir rendered anthems from "Elijah." The day's collections amounted to about £10. The Rev. W. L. Schroeder will commence his ministry on the first Sunday in July.

Ilkeston.—On Monday, March 23, the Rev. T. P. Spedding, after preaching at Newark on the previous day, gave a capital lantern lecture on his visit to the Unitarians of Transylvania. Alderman Hunt, J.P., kindly presided. The audience was deeply interested in the inspiring story of the struggle for civil and religious liberty which our Transylvanian brethren have manfully sustained since the time of the Reformation.

Liverpool: North End Domestic Mission.—The forty-ninth annual meeting of this Mission was held on Friday, March 20, at the Ullet-road Church Hall, Mr. W. C. Rawlins, J.P., presiding. The chairman alluded to the loss the Mission had sustained in the death of Mr. Charles Jones, a past president, and for many years a member of the committee. The Rev. Walter Reynolds, the Missionary at Bond-street, in replying to the customary vote of thanks, mentioned the difficulty in carrying on the work owing to the large Catholic population surrounding Bond-street, and to the fact that practically all the members of the Mission had to come there from long distances. A sub-committee was finally appointed consisting of Rev. H. W. Hawkes, the new president, Mr. John Hughes, and the Rev. Walter Reynolds, to consider the question of removal, and to report to the committee. The proceedings terminated with a vote of thanks to Mr. W. C. Rawlins for his services as president for the past five years, and for taking the chair at the meeting.

Manchester: Pendleton.—The annual Congregational meeting was held on Saturday, March 21. Mr. J. Wigley presided, and, in moving the adoption of the report, expressed his pleasure at the satisfactory nature of the report, referring especially to the great assistance rendered to the Church by the Ladies' Sewing Society. He appealed to all connected with the Church and school to redouble their energy and enthusiasm in view of the special effort to raise a sum of £600 to clear off the deficit on the Church account, and to repair and beautify the Church and school buildings. For this object a substantial sum is already promised. Exceptional loss of members by death and removals was recorded, but a gain also of 16 new members, and increased attendances at the services. A very hearty vote of thanks was accorded to the Rev. N. Anderton for his devoted and untiring work in Church and school. Mr. Anderton, in reply, expressed his

deep gratitude to the members and friends of the Church for their loyal support, and extended a hearty welcome to the new members. He spoke very hopefully of the prospects of the Church. During the evening Mrs. J. Harwood, on behalf of the members of the Ladies' Sewing Society, presented to Mrs. Anderton a handsome gold brooch, as a token of their admiration and appreciation for her untiring zeal and devotion as president of the Society. Mrs. Anderton gratefully accepted the gift.

Whitchurch, Salop.—On Wednesday, March 18, the last social evening for the winter season was held in the school-room. This makes the fourth of its kind since October last. In addition to these, two very successful concerts have been given, and on February 24 the Rev. and Mrs. Pond gave an "At Home," sixty accepted the invitation, and a very pleasant and profitable evening was spent. In moving a vote of thanks to the host and hostess, Mr. Groom (church sec.) said that, comparing the present with the previous year, the life and activity in the church exceeded his most sanguine expectations. Mr. Pond, in responding, said it was one of the greatest pleasures he and Mrs. Pond had yet experienced to meet so many genuine friends. Although the morning congregation was poor, yet the evening had more than doubled during the year. The interior of the building had been thoroughly cleaned and renovated, and the old gas burners replaced by inverted incandescent ones. A committee of ladies were working very hard for a bazaar to be held in May, and it was hoped to realise a sufficient sum to do some very necessary repairs to the external part of the building. On Sunday evening, March 8, Mr. Pond preached his first anniversary sermon. The subject was "Consecration."

Wimbleton (Appointment).—The Rev. W. E. Williams, B.A. (of Manchester College, Oxford), has received and accepted an invitation to the pulpit at Wimbleton. The service was taken last Sunday by Mr. Williams for the first time as minister of the church.

OUR CALENDAR.

It is requested that notice of any alteration in the Calendar be sent to the Publisher not later than Thursday Afternoon.

SUNDAY, March 29.

LONDON.

Acton, Creffield-road, 11 and 7, Rev. ARTHUR HURN.
Bermondsey, Fort-road, 7, Rev. JESSE HIPPERSON.
Blackfriars Mission and Stamford-street Chapel, 11 and 7, Rev. J. C. BALLANTYNE.
Brixton, Unitarian Christian Church, Effra-road, 11 and 7, Rev. G. C. CRESSEY, D.D.
Child's Hill, All Souls', Weech-road, Finchley-road, 11.15 and 6.30, Rev. EDGAR DAPLYN.
Croydon, Free Christian Church, Wellesley-road, 11 and 7, Rev. W. J. JUPP.
Deptford, Church-street, 11.15 and 6.30, Rev. A. J. MARCHANT.
Essex Church, The Mall, Notting Hill Gate, 11 and 6.30, Rev. F. K. FREESTON.
Forest Gate, corner of Dunbar-road, Upton-lane, 11 and 6.30, Rev. H. WOODS PERRIS.
Hackney, New Gravel Pit Church, Chatham-place, 11.15, Rev. GORDON COOPER; 7, Rev. H. RAWLINGS, M.A.
Hampstead, Rosslyn-hill Chapel, 11.15 and 6.30, Rev. H. GOW, B.A.
Highgate Hill, Unitarian Christian Church, 11, Rev. A. A. CHARLESWORTH; 7, Mr. H. VIVIAN, M.P.

Iford, Assembly Rooms, Broadway, 7, Mr. H. G. CHANCELLOR.
Islington, Unity Church, Upper-street, 11 and 7, Rev. E. SAVELL HICKS, M.A.
Kentish Town, Clarence-road, N.W., 11.15 and 7, Rev. F. HANKINSON.
Kilburn, Quex-road, 11 and 7, Rev. R. P. FARLEY, B.A.
Lewisham, Unitarian Christian Church, High-street, 11 and 7, Rev. W. W. C. POPE.
Little Portland-street Chapel, 11.15 and 7, Rev. J. PAGE HOPPS.
Mansford-street Church and Mission, Bethnal Green, Rev. GORDON COOPER.
Peckham, Avondale-road, 11, Rev. J. HIPPERSON; 6.30, Mr. D. DELTA EVANS.
Plumstead, Common-road Unitarian Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. L. JENKINS JONES.
Richmond, Free Church, Ormond-road, 11.15 and 7, Rev. FELIX TAYLOR, B.A.
Stepney Green, College Chapel, 11, Mr. W. R. MARSHALL; 7, Mr. EDWARD CAPLETON.
Stoke Newington Green, 11.15 and 7, Dr. F. W. G. FOAT, M.A.
Stratford Unitarian Church, 11, Mr. G. W. EAMER; 6.30, Mr. A. J. CLARKE.
Sydenham School of Art, Vanner-road, 7, Rev. G. CRITCHLEY, B.A.
Wandsworth Unitarian Christian Church, East Hill, 11 and 7, Rev. W. G. TARRANT, B.A.
Wimbleton, Smaller Worpel Hall, 11 and 7, Rev. W. E. WILLIAMS, B.A.
Wood Green, Unity Church, 11 and 7, Rev. Dr. MUMMERY.

ABERYSTWYTH, New Street Meeting House, 11 and 6.30, Mr. D. ROBERTSON DAVIES.
BATH, Trim-street Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. J. M. McDOWELL.
BLACKPOOL, Dickson-road, North Shore, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. ROBERT MCGEE.
BLACKPOOL, South Shore Unitarian Free Church, Lytham-road South, 11 and 6.30.
BOURNEMOUTH, Unitarian Church, West Hill-road, 11 and 6.30, Rev. C. C. COE.
BRIGHTON, Free Christian Church, New-road, 11 and 7, Rev. PRIESTLEY PRIME.
BUXTON, Hartington-road Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. GEORGE STREET.
CANTERBURY, Ancient Chapel, Blackfriars, 10.50, Rev. J. A. SMITH.
CHESTER, Matthew Henry's Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. D. JENKIN EVANS.
DOVER, Adrian-street, near Market-square, 11 and 6.30, Rev. C. A. GNEVER, B.A.
DUBLIN, Stephen's Green West, 12, Rev. G. H. VANCE, B.D.
GUILDFORD, Ward-street Church, North-street, 11, "The Passing in Christianity"; 6.30, "The Christ of Personal Experience." Mr. GEORGE WARD.
HASTINGS, South Terrace, Queen's-road, 11 and 6.30, Rev. S. BURROWS.
HORSHAM, Free Christian Church, Worthing-road, 11 and 6.30, Rev. J. J. MARTEN.
LEEDS, Mill Hill, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. C. HARGROVE, M.A.
LEICESTER, Free Christian Church, 11 and 6.30, Mr. E. PICKERING, B.A.
LIVERPOOL, Ancient Chapel of Toxteth, 11 and 6.30, Rev. CHARLES CRADDOCK.
LIVERPOOL, Hope-street Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. H. D. ROBERTS.
LIVERPOOL, Ullet-road, Sefton Park, 11 and 6.30, Rev. J. C. ODGERS, B.A.
MAIDSTONE, Unitarian Church, Earl-street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. ALEXANDER FARQUHARSON.
NEW BRIGHTON and LISCARD, Memorial Church, Manor-road, 11 and 6.30, Rev. E. PARRY.
NEWPORT, Isle of Wight, 11 and 6.30, Rev. H. M. LIVERS.
OXFORD, Manchester College, 11.30, Rev. L. P. JACKS, M.A.
PORTSMOUTH, High-street Chapel, 11 and 6.45, Rev. JAMES BURTON, M.A.
PORTSMOUTH, St. Thomas-street, 11 and 6.45, Mr. T. BOND.
SCARBOROUGH, Westborough, 10.45 and 6.30.
SEVENOAKS, Bessell's Green, The Old Meeting House, 11, Rev. F. T. REED.
SHEFFIELD, Upper Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. J. WALTER COCK.
SIDMOUTH, Old Meeting, High-street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. WILLIAM AGAR.
SOUTHPORT, Portland-street Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. MATTHEW R. SCOTT.
TORQUAY, Unity Hall, Lower Union-street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. A. E. O'CONNOR, B.D.

TUNBRIDGE WELLS, Mechanics' Institute, Dudley-road, 11.
WEST KIRBY, Tynwald Hall, opposite Station, 11 and 6.30, Rev. H. W. HAWKES.

SOUTH AFRICA.

CAPETOWN, Free Protestant (Unitarian) Church, Hout-street, 6.45, Rev. RAMSDEN BALMFORTH.

DEATHS.

WHITE.—On March 21, at the Daglands, Fowey, Mary, third daughter of the late William White, of Fairfield, Loughborough, aged 75.

HIBBERT.—On March 20, Gerald, third son of Mrs. and the late A. T. Hibbert, aged 28. Interred at Hyde Chapel, Gee Cross, March 24.

Schools, etc.

CHANNING HOUSE HIGH SCHOOL
AND BOARDING SCHOOL FOR GIRLS.
HIGHGATE, LONDON, N. Head Mistress: Miss LILIAN TALBOT, B.A. Honours Lond. Preparation for London Matriculation, Trinity College, and Associated Board of Musicians Healthysituation, Hockey, Cricket, and Swimming. Special terms for daughters of Unitarian ministers. Apply to the HEAD MISTRESS.

WILLASTON SCHOOL, NANTWICH.—The next Entrance Examination will be held at the School on March 31. For particulars of admission on the Foundation apply to the HEADMASTER.

WEST HEATH SCHOOL, HAMPSHIRE. Healthy liberal education for Boys and Girls under 14. Boarders and Day-pupils. Illustrated prospectus from the Principals: C. E. RICE, M.A., and Mrs. GARRETT RICE.

SOMERVILLE SCHOOL, ABERYSTWYTH.
Facing sea. Thorough modern education for Girls in all branches. Excellent results in Music and Art Examinations; Matriculation, and Cambridge Higher Local. Special course for delicate Girls. Gymnasium, Swimming, Tennis, Hockey.
PRINCIPAL ... MISS MARLES-THOMAS.

Situations, VACANT AND WANTED

TO PARENTS AND GUARDIANS.
KYNOCH LIMITED have VACANCIES in their Commercial Departments for a few YOUNG GENTLEMEN of good Education and Manners. No Premium required. Term of Indentures four years.—Apply by letter only to the Secretary, Kynoch Limited, Witton, Birmingham.

LADY would give services in return for comfortable home. Domesticated, musical, good needlewoman. References.—F. G. H., Gray, Stationer, Cotham Hill, Bristol.

WANTED, by a respectable, middle-aged person, a situation as Domestic Help. Good personal character, competent to take entire charge, abstainer and thoroughly trustworthy. Town.—L., c/o Mrs. CARR, 4, Wilmington-street, London, W.C.

"THE UNITARIAN MONTHLY."—Magazine for Unitarian Propaganda. Adopted by churches with or without local page. Issued for last Sunday in each previous month. One copy post free, 1d.—1s. 6d. a year; 9d. per dozen; 3s. 6d. per 100; extra charge local page.—Address to EDITOR, The Parsonage, Mottram, Manchester.

BLACKFRIARS MISSION and STAMFORD STREET CHAPEL.—The Annual Meeting will be held at 7.45 p.m. on Tuesday, April 7, 1908, at Stamford Street Chapel, S.E., when P. M. MARTINEAU, Esq., will preside, supported by the Rev. W. Copeland Bowie, Rev. W. G. Tarrant, B.A., C. F. Pearson, Esq., and other ministers and laymen. Tea, to which friends are cordially invited, will be provided at 7 p.m.

Established  50 Years.

Callard & Bowser's
Butter-Scotch

"Really
Wholesome Confectionery"
—LANCET.

A sweetmeat for all, and may be given
with confidence to the youngest child.
In paper packets and tin boxes—
various sizes.

Manufactory: London, W.C.

Board and Residence.

BOURNEMOUTH.—Elvaston, West Cliff, BOARDING ESTABLISHMENT. Unrivalled position on sea front, close to the Highcliffe Hotel. 60 rooms. Full-sized billiard tables. Lovely grounds, with access to Cliff Promenade. Due south. Near Unitarian Church. Illustrated Tariff.—Apply, Mrs. and Mr. Pocock.

ST. LEONARDS-ON-SEA.—“Cranstock,” 59, Warrior-square. First-class BOARD AND RESIDENCE; most comfortable throughout. Sea View, excellent cuisine, billiard and smoke room, sanitary certificate.—Mr. and Mrs. SIDNEY P. POTTER.

LANGLEY HOUSE DAWLISH, DEVON.—BOARD AND RESIDENCE for Ladies. Beautiful country. Sea and moorland. Bracing sunny winter resort. Through trains from all parts. Responsible charge taken of the younger guests. Prospectus from PROPRIETOR.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS.

HOME FOR GIRL-STUDENTS, Frankfurt-am-Main, now Staufenstrasse 2. Most central situation for Conservatorium, Concerts, Opera. Sunny aspect. Prospectus on application to Miss PALMER.

THE SIMPLE LIFE HOME (Sea View), 3, ALBANY ROAD, SOUTHPORT. PRESS OPINIONS.

Sheffield Telegraph: “Imagine a house spaciouly built and furnished with just those things which are needful for health, comfort, and the refinements of existence. Throughout simplicity and exquisite taste.”

Manchester City News: “Health and comfort carefully considered.”

Milgate Monthly: “Refinement, and the best in art and literature, make it an ideal house. We were amazed at the variety of food.”

Send to WARDEN for Prospectus.

TYPEWRITING, COPYING, TRANSLATING. Authors' MSS. accurately copied at reasonable rates. Special quotations for quantities. First-class work guaranteed. Evening and Secretarial work undertaken with Machine; also typing on machine direct from dictation. **SERMONS A SPECIALITY.**—Miss E. L. STENT, 33, Crouch Hall-road, Crouch End, N., and 12, Manchester-avenue, London, E.C. City Telephone No.: 12277 Central.

THE MINISTERIAL FELLOWSHIP SETTLEMENTS BUREAU brings together Congregations needing Ministers, and Ministers desiring a fresh charge. The Membership Roll of the Fellowship includes 150 Ministers, and is increasing annually. Congregations are invited to communicate with the Rev. J. CROWTHER HIRST, Gateacre, Liverpool, the Hon. Sec. of the Bureau. CHARLES ROPER, President of the C. J. STREET, Hon. Secretary of the Fellowship

LONDON SUNDAY SCHOOL SOCIETY.—The Annual Musical Festival, consisting of a Competition between School Choirs, followed by a Concert in which the United Choirs will take part, will be held at Essex Hall, Saturday, April 4. Competition, 3.30 p.m. Concert, 6 p.m. Tickets—Adults 1/6 and 1/-, and Children 6d.—can be obtained from the Sunday School Association at Essex Hall.

TYPEWRITING.

Telephone at once for estimates for your Typewriting, Duplicating, and Copying. Commercial Correspondence a speciality. First-class work at moderate charges.

5 per cent. discount if this paper is mentioned.

C. HERBERT CÉSAR,

10, Grange Road, Canonbury, London, N. Secrecy guaranteed. Special terms for permanent work. TELEPHONE: 1219 NORTH.

CHARMING ARRAY VALENCIENNES LACE, this season's make, wide range patterns, long lengths, sold direct from the factory, almost 50 per cent. reductions. Our 1/- post free sample parcel, assorted widths, attracts exceptional orders. Torchon and Fancy Laces, extraordinary prices.—M. MANSON & Co., 1, Church gate, Nottingham.

Recent Publications.

THE SOUL OF THE BIBLE. Selections from the Old and New Testaments and the Apocrypha. By ULYSSES G. B. PIERCE. Cloth, 3s. net, by post 3s. 4d. Thin paper, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net, by post 3s. 9d.

FATHER TAYLOR. A Biography of the Founder of the Seamen's Bethel, Boston, U.S.A. By ROBERT COLLYER. 2s. net, postage 3d.

PAUL. By Prof. Dr. W. WREDE. With Preface by J. ESTLIN CARPENTER, M.A., D.Litt. Translated by E. W. LUMMIS, M.A. 2s. net, postage 3d.

RABBI, MESSIAH, MARTYR. A Modern Picture of the Story of Jesus. By HERBERT RIX. B.A. 1s. net, postage 2d.

THE SOURCES OF OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE LIFE OF JESUS. By Prof. PAUL WERNLE, D.Theol. Translated by E. W. LUMMIS, M.A. 2s. net, postage 3d.

FOUR AMERICAN LEADERS. Essays on Franklin, Washington, Channing, and Emerson. By CHARLES W. ELIOT. 2s. net, postage 3d.

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By Dr. JAMES DRUMMOND, M.A., LL.D. 10s. 6d. net, postage 6d.

ESSEX HALL, ESSEX STREET, STRAND, W.C.

JOHN PAGE HOPPS' MONTHLY.
THE COMING DAY.

ENLARGED. PRICE THREEPENCE.

Contents for APRIL.

Picturesque France and its Malades.

Little Portland Street Discourses:

1. The Day of Small Things.

2. Woman's Work in Public Life.

The New Creed.

A Journalist's Dying Message.

A Glimpse of Tariff Reform.

Christian Socialists to the Rescue.

A Starved Miser.

Notes on Books and Notes by the Way.

Gems “of Purest Ray Serene.”

A. C. FIFIELD, 44, Fleet-street, and all Booksellers.

HOLIDAY GUIDE

To Unitarian and Kindred Churches at Seaside and Country Resorts.

LIST OF LODGING AND BOARDING HOUSES.

Ready Early in April for Easter.

Enclose penny stamp for copy to
Rev. THOS. P. SPEDDING,
Clovercroft, Buckingham Road, Heaton
Chapel, near Stockport.

THACKERAY HOTEL

(TEMPERANCE),
GREAT RUSSELL STREET, LONDON.
Opposite the British Museum.

FIREPROOF FLOORS. PERFECT SANITATION.
TELEPHONE. NIGHT PORTER.

This large and well-appointed TEMPERANCE HOTEL has Passenger Lifts, Electric Light throughout. Bathrooms on every Floor; Spacious Dining, Drawing, Writing, Reading, Billiard and Smoking Rooms. Heated throughout. Bedrooms (including attendance) from 3s. 6d. to 6s. Full Tariff and Testimonials on application. Inclusive charge for Bedroom, Attendance, Table d'Hôte Breakfast and Dinner, from 8s. 6d. to 10s. 6d. per day.

Telegraphic Address: “Thackeray,” London.

EATON'S TEMPERANCE HOTEL,

22, Guilford Street, Russell Square, LONDON.

Facing the Gardens of the Foundling Institution. Central. Homelike. Beds from 1s. 6d. Breakfast and Tea from 1s. Patronized repeatedly by many visitors during the 30 years of its existence.

BRASS PLATES
Of Every Description

Made by WALTER BOWLES,

20, AIR STREET, PICCADILLY, LONDON, W.

DESIGNER and Heraldic Engraver on Gold, Silver, and Ivory. Letter cases mounted with Arms, Crests, and Monograms. Rubber Stamps of every description. Pads, Inks, &c.

Send for quotations.

Established 1889.

E. Norman Reed & Co.,



Artists
in
Stained
&
Leaded
Glass.

Memorial
Windows.

Mosaics.

Church Decorators.

13, Lisle Street, NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.
Under the direction of Geo. G. LAIDLER.

THERE'S NO DOUBT ABOUT THE VALUE. Irish Linen hemstitched and embroidered sideboard covers, 13 by 54 in., only 2/11. Quality guaranteed. Many other splendid bargains. Lovely patterns post free.—HUTTON'S, 5, Larne, Ireland.

19TH CENTURY BUILDING SOCIETY,
ADELAIDE-PLACE, LONDON BRIDGE, E.C.

Assets, £167,000.

DIRECTORS.

Chairman—Sir H. W. LAWRENCE, Bart., J.P.
Deputy-Chairman—MARK H. JUDGE, A.R.I.B.A.
Miss CECIL GRADWELL, ALEXANDER W. LAW-
F. H. A. HARCASTLE, RENCH.
F.S.I. Miss ORME.

STEPHEN SEAWARD TAYLOR.

A SOUND AND READY MEANS OF INVESTMENT.

PREFERENCE SHARES of £10 each now being issued at 4 per cent. Interest free of Income Tax.

DEPOSITS RECEIVED AT 3 AND 3½ PER CENT. Interest free of Income Tax.

ADVANCES made to buy or build your own house.

Repayments, Survey Fees, and Law Charges low. Prospectus free.

CHARLES A. PRICE, Manager.

Terms for Advertisements.

Advertisements for THE INQUIRER should be addressed to the PUBLISHER, 3, Essex-street, Strand, London, W.C., and should reach the office not later than Twelve o'clock on THURSDAY, to appear the same week. The scale of charges is as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
PER PAGE ...	6	0	0
HALF-PAGE ...	3	0	0
PER COLUMN...	2	0	0
INCH IN COLUMN ...	0	3	6

Special Terms for a Series.

Calendar Notices, 10s. per year, 2 lines.

Births, Marriages, Deaths, 6d. per line. Minimum charge, 1/-

Situations Vacant and Wanted,

20 words, 1s.; every 6 words after, 4d.

3 insertions charged as 2

All payments in respect to THE INQUIRER to be made to E. KENNEDY, 3, Essex-street, Strand, London, W.C. The entire remittance should accompany all orders to insert Advertisements.

Printed by UNWIN BROTHERS, LTD., 27, Pilgrim-street, Ludgate Hill, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors by E. KENNEDY, at the Office, 3, Essex-street, Strand, London, W.C. Sole Agent, JOHN HEYWOOD, 20 to 28, Lamb Conduit-street, W.C. Manchester (Wholesale). JOHN HEYWOOD, Deane-gate.—Saturday, March 28, 1908.